DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 755 FL 017 099

AUTHOR	Cortina, Rodolfo J.; Roca, Ana
TITLE	Foreign Language Instruction in Florida: An Assessment of Its Future. A Report from the Profession.
INSTITUTION	Florida International Univ., Miami. Center for Multilingual and Multicultural Studies.
SPONS AGENCY	Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE	86
NOTE	151p.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Admission Criteria; Articulation (Education); Classical Languages; College Admission; Community Colleges; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Planning; Educational Technology; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Instructional Improvement; Language Enrollment; Language Proficiency; Language Tests; Policy Formation; Public Colleges; Resource Allocation; *Second Language Instruction; Staff Development; State Surveys; *Statewide Planning; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida

ABSTRACT

A survey of the status of foreign language instruction in Florida was designed to examine educational needs to support implementation of a state statute requiring two years of language instruction for admission to Florida's nine public universities. Specific project objectives included: (1) recommending the establishment of foreign language proficiency standards for each educational level in order to assess course equivalencies in high schools, community colleges, and universities, to evaluate placement tests for moving students through instruction, and to judge the applicability of instructional technologies; (2) developing policy recommendations for the State Board of Education, Board of Regents, and State Board of Community Colleges; and (3) designing a resource requirement model for foreign language instruction that identifies and generates the basis for allocation of additional staff and instructional equipment and for program development. The report contains: a description of the status of foreign language education in Florida, including information on enrollments, staffing, student-teacher ratios, instructional technology, testing, teaching methods, and faculty development at all levels; reports and recommendations concerning articulation, assessment, staff development, use of instructional technology, classical and less-commonly-taught languages, special category students, and the resource requirement model; and an implementation plan for instructional improvement at all levels. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED298755

Foreign Language Instruction in Florida: An Assessment of its Status and Recommendations for its Future

A Report From the Profession

Submitted
by
Dr. Rodolfo J. Cortina
Director
Center for Multilingual & Multicultural Studies
and
Dr. Ana Roca
Assistant Professor
Department of Modern Languages
Florida International University
Tamiami Campus
Miami, Florida 33199

to the
Honorable Betty Castor
Florida Commissioner of Education
State of Florida

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Cortina

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

FL017694

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Foreign Language Instruction in Florida: An Assessment of its Status and Recommendations for its Future

A Report From the Profession

Submitted
by
Dr. Rodolfo J. Cortina
Director
Center for Multilingual & Multicultural Studies
and
Dr. Ana Roca
Assistant Professor
Department of Modern Languages
Florida International University
Tamiami Campus
Miami, Florida 33199

to the
Honorable Betty Castor
Florida Commissioner of Education
State of Florida

FLIF STAFF

Dr. Rodolfo J. Cortina
Principal Investigator

Dr. Ana Roca
Project Manager

Ms. Elvira Fins
Administrative Secretary

Maria Antonieta Garcia
Project Assistant

Lourdes Simon
Student Assistant

Soledad Diaz
Student Assistant

Esther Juste
Research Assistant

Nora Sullivan
Student Assistant

Management Team

Dr. Rodolfo J. Cortina
Director
Center for Multilingual
and Multicultural Studies-PC 538
Florida International University
Miami, Florida 33199
305-554-3207

Dr. Angela Lupo-Anderson
Director Program Review
Board of Regents
State University System
Collins Building
107 W. Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904-488-7702 SC 278-7702

Ms. Wally Lyshkov
Supervisor
Foreign Languages
Dade County Public Schools
1450 N.E. 2nd Ave. - Room 914
Miami, Florida 33132
(305)376-1961

Dr. Paul Parker
Bureau Chief
Program Support & Services
Division of Community Colleges
Knott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
SC 278-0555

Dr. Suzanne L. Richter
Dean of Instruction
Miami-Dade Community College
New World Center - Room 1367
300 N.E. 2nd Ave.
Miami, Florida 33132
305-347-3043

Mr. Gabriel Valdes
Foreign Language Consultant
Bureau of Curriculum Services
Executive Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
904-278-6046
SC 486-6046 SC 441-3207

Steering Committee

Dr. Ronald Bryant
Orange County School Board
P.O. Box 271
Orlando, Florida 32802
305-422-3200

Dr. John A. Carpenter
Associate Vice President
for Academic Affairs and
Dean of Graduate Studies
Florida International University
Tamiami Campus - Room PC 538
Miami, Florida 33199
305-554-2455

Dr. Anthony Cervone
University of Central Florida
4000 Central Florida Blvd.
Orlando, Florida 32816
305-275-2472

Dr. Angela Lupo-Anderson
Director, Program Review
Board of Regents
State University System
Collins Building
107 W. Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904-488-7702
SC 278-7702

Ms. Wally Lyshkov
Supervisor
Foreign Languages
Dade County Public Schools
1450 N.E. 2nd Ave. - Room 914
Miami, Florida 33132

Dr. Rosita Martinez
Valencia Community College
190 S. Orange Ave.
Orlando, Florida 32802
305-299-5000 - Ext. 1-300

Dr. Ivy Mitchell
President FFLA
2307 Vincent Drive
Tallahassee, Florida 32303
SC 284-1025 SC 329-1200

Dr. Paul Parker
Bureau Chief
Program Support & Services
Division of Community Colleges
Knott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
SC 278-0555
SC 441-2455

Mr. Gabriel Valdes
Foreign Language Consultant
Bureau of Curriculum Services
Florida Department of Education
Executive Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
904-278-6046
SC 278-6046

State University System

Dr. Karl Heinrich Barch
University of Central Florida
P.O. Box 2500
Orlando, Florida 32816
305-275-2000
SC 245-0111

Professor Juan A. Caballero
University of West Florida
Pensacola, Florida 32514
904-474-2927

Dr. Carlos Cano
Division of Language
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620
813-974-2011
SC 574-2011

Dr. Irene d'Almeida
University of North Florida
4567 St. Johns Bluff Rd., 5
Jacksonville, Florida 32216
904-646-2666
SC 661-2666

Dr. Raymond Gay-Crosier
Dept. of Romance Languages
and Literatures
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611
904-392-2017/18

Dr. Reinaldo Sanchez
Modern Languages Department
Florida International University
Tamiami Campus
Miami, Florida 33199
305-554-2851
SC 441-2853

Dr. Ernest Weiser
Dept. of Languages & Linguistics
Hum. Bldg. 140
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Florida 33431
305-393-3861
SC 463-3861

Dr. James Wyatt
Dept. of Modern Languages
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
904-644-3727

Dr. Ann Hooper/
Dr. James Earl Norman
Language and Literature
Florida A & M University
418 Tucker Hall
Tallahassee, Florida 32307
904-599-3555

Community Colleges

Dr. Ann Bachmann
Seminole Community College
Highway 17-92
Sandford, Florida 32771
305-323-1450

Ms. Jennifer Burg
Lake Sumter Community College
5900 U.S. 441, South
Leesburg, Florida 32788
904-787-3747
SC 387-1011

Ms. Dorothy T. Clemmons
Chipola Junior College
Marianna, Florida 32446
904-526-1761
SC 246-1444

Dr. Oswaldo Lopez
Miami Dade Community College
Wolfson Campus
300 N.E. 2nd Ave.
Miami, Florida 33132
305-347-3218

Dr. Helen McLean
Communications Division
St. Petersburg Junior College
2465 Drew St.
Clearwater, Florida 33575
813-791-2609

Dr. John Pawlowski
Broward Community College
North Campus
1000 Coconut Creek Blvd.
Pompano Beach, Florida
305-973-2387

Dr. Munir (Bill) Sarkis
Daytona Beach Community College
P.O. Box 1111
Daytona Beach, Florida 32015
904-255-8131

Ms. Marie Smith
Florida Junior College
South Campus
11901 Beach Blvd.
Jacksonville, Florida 32216
305-646-2312

Dr. Leon Walker
Professor of French
Pensacola Junior College
1000 College Blvd.
Pensacola, Florida 32504
904-476-5410 Ext. 1427

Public Schools

Ms. Belle Altice
Foreign Languages/ESOL
P.O. Box 1910
Daytona Beach, Florida 32015
904-255-6475 Ext. 204

Mr. Angel Bustelo
Supervisor, Foreign Languages
Hillsborough School Board
901 E. Kennedy Blvd.
Tampa, Florida 33601
813-272-4823

Ms. Eleanor Garcia
Foreign Language/
Bilingual Coordinator
Monroe County School Board
242 White Street
Key West, Florida 33040
305-296-6523, Ext. 244

Ms. Mary G. Johnson
Coordinator, Foreign Languages
and Bilingual Education
Lee County School Board
2055 Central Avenue
Fort Myers, Florida 33901
813-334-1102 Ext. 341
SC 559-5341

Dr. Esther Oteiza
Supervisor of Foreign Languages
Fine and Performing Arts
Marion County School Board
P.O. Box 670
Ocala, Florida 32670
904-732-8041
SC 355-1011

Mr. Richard Saporita
Foreign Lang. Curr. Specialist
3323 Belvedere Rd.
West Palm Beach, Florida 33402
305-684-5117
SC 472-5453

Mrs. Lissi Spencer
Resource Teacher for
Intensive English and Foreign Lang.
Leon County Schools
2757 W. Pensacola Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904-487-7237

Mrs. Shelley Lee Waters
Bilingual and Foreign
Language Supervisor
Alachua County School Board
620 E. University Avenue
Gainesville, Florida 32611
904-395-0612

Ms. Carmine Zinn
Supervisor, Foreign Language
Pinellas County School Board
Largo Curriculum Center
205 - 4th Street
Largo, Florida 33540
813-585-9951 Ext. 266

Resource Persons

Dr. David Birdsong
Department of Romance
Languages and Literature
College of Liberal Arts
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611

Dr. Jean Casagrande
English Language Institute
Norman Hall 313
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611
904-392-2070
392-0639

Dr. Sheila Dickison
Classics Department
3-C Arts & Sciences Bldg.
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611

Dr. David Ehlert
State Board of Community Colleges
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Ms. Linda Gaskin
Edward H. White High School
1700 Old Middleburg Road
Jacksonville, Florida 32210
904-786-4020

Ms. Lula Keys
Foreign Languages Department
Valencia Community College
190 Orange Avenue
Orlando, Florida 32809

Professor Frank W. Medley, Jr., Ph.D.
Dept. of Foreign Languages and Literatures
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

Ms. Margaret Sheehan
3454 S. Peninsula Drive
Daytona Beach, Florida

Fred Daniels
Department of Education
Executive Building
Tallahassee, Florida
904-278-6046
S 278-6046

Dr. Reynaldo Jimenez
University of Florida
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Dept. of Modern Lang. and Literatures
Gainesville, Florida 32611
904-392-2017
SC 622-2017

Dr. Dolly Young
Department of Romance
Languages and Literatures
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611

Foreign Language Instruction in Florida:

An Assessment of its Status and Recommendations for its Future

Table of Contents

FLIF Staff
List of FLIF Members

Table of Contents

I. Introduction 1
II. Status of Foreign Language Instruction 3
III. Reports & Recommendations 25
  A. Articulation 25
  B. Language Assessment 29
  C. Staff Development 31
  D. Instructional Technology 33
  E. Classical & Less-Commonly-Taught Languages 34
  F. Special Category Student 36
  G. Resource Requirement Model 37
IV. An Implementation Plan for the Improvement of Foreign Language Instruction in Florida at all Levels 40

Appendices

  A. October 17, 1986 memorandum from Charles B. Reed: Interpretation of 1986 legislative changes to 240.233 F.S. concerning admissions of students to universities 41
  B. FLIF Surveys: 1) Assessing the Current Situation of Foreign Language Instruction in Florida's Post Secondary Institutions; 2) Foreign Language Instruction in Florida Project School District Survey 50
  C. February 19, 1986 memorandum from the FLIF project staff regarding an invitation to attend open meetings on Foreign Language Instruction in the State of Florida 72
  D. Agendas of FLIF meetings 73
  E. ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines (1986) 83
  F. Expected Levels of Absolute Proficiency in Languages Taught at the Foreign Service Institute (Revised April 1973) 89
  G. Curriculum Frameworks for Foreign Language Education in the State of Florida 90
  H. Sample Curriculum Frameworks from the Public Schools 102
  I. Working documents: Drafts of Community College and University Frameworks 108
  J. FLIF Project Task Forces 127
  K. Companies Producing Films and Videotapes for Foreign Languages 129
  L. List of Abbreviations 137

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Foreign Language Instruction in Florida (FLIF) Project

Introduction

In 1984, the Florida Legislature passed Florida Statue 240.233(1)(b), which requires that after August 1, 1987, all students shall have two years of a foreign language or its equivalent in order to be admitted to any one of Florida's nine public universities. High school graduates without two years of foreign language study who enroll in a community college must complete this requirement before admission to the universities as transfers. In 1986, the legislature assigned to the Articulation Coordinating Committee the responsibility to define the skills and competencies representing the equivalent of two years of high school foreign language at the college level. This committee must also identifies alternative means by which students can meet the admissions requirement.

Implementing this requirement has implications for all students seeking baccalaureate degrees from Florida's public universities. Approximately 30,000 students enter Florida's public universities annually from high schools and community colleges. In order to be prepared for the new foreign language requirement, the 67 school districts, 28 community colleges, and 9 universities had to assess by 1987 their needs for additional teachers and instructional support personnel, expansion of staff and program development programs, curriculum revision, and instructional equipment. From a preliminary analysis, it was apparent that current instructional resources, from a quantitative and qualitative standpoint, are insufficient to support the intent of the legislative mandate. It was evident as well that the policies of the State Board of Education, Board of Regents (BOR), and State Board of Community Colleges (SBCC) require further study with possible revision as a consequence of the mandate.

The purpose of the Foreign Language Instruction in Florida Project was to examine the educational needs of the State in foreign language education related to the referred statutes. The examination of the need for uniformity, human and capital resources, and the cost of implementing the statutes, therefore, led to the project objectives:

1. Recommend for each level of education foreign language proficiency standards to:
    a. assess course equivalencies offered in high schools, community colleges and universities;
    b. evaluate appropriate foreign language placement tests as a means of moving students through instruction on an individualized basis as standards are achieved;
    c. evaluate the applicability of instructional technologies (instructional computers, interactive video, video cassettes, radio, television, and traditional language laboratory equipment) to the instructional needs of students and teachers.
2. Develop recommendations for policy changes in the rules of the State Board of Education, BOR, and SBCC related to the implementation of the new foreign language requirement at all levels of education.
3. Design a resource requirement model for foreign language instruction which identifies and generates the basis for additional staff, program development, and instructional equipment.

Based on the data and recommendations from this project, the state and its public educational institutions will determine the appropriate actions to make adjustments and improvements in foreign language instruction. Thus it will be possible for students to move through instruction efficiently and at levels of performance commensurate with the standards defined through the project. The project yielded additional recommendations for policy actions by appropriate state level governing and coordinating boards to implement such matters as proficiency standards for foreign languages, establishment of course equivalencies, and identification of appropriate proficiency tests. The project provided a means by which the funding support for all levels of education can be identified. The public school, community college, and university systems will use the resource requirement model for refunding budget allocations for the legislature and for planning for internal reallocation. The project's final report will be distributed to foreign language faculty and institutional leaders so that there will be widespread understanding of the project findings. This project was an integral part of the state level review of foreign languages for the Community Colleges.

The Department of Education, through the assistance of Dr. Marshall Frinks, of the Commissioner's staff, allocated approximately $63,000 from Title II of the Education for Economic Security Act (Public Law 98-377) to support this project. In June, 1986, the SBCC allocated approximately $33,500 to the project. These funds were distributed through contracts to Florida International University's (F.I.U.) Center for Multilingual and Multicultural Studies to coordinate and conduct the project for the state. Dr. Rodolfo J. Cortina, Center Director, was the principal investigator for the project, while the Project Manager was Dr. Ana Roca, Assistant Professor of Modern Languages, F.I.U. A Project Management Team composed of representatives from F.I.U., Miami Dade Community College, Dade County Public Schools, BOR, SBCC, and the Public Schools Division of the Department of Education was responsible for the project oversight. A Project Steering Committee composed of the members of the management team, representatives from professional foreign language organizations, and selected faculty members, reviewed the Project work-plan and the report.

The success of the project depended on the involvement of approximately 45 foreign language educators representing all sectors and levels of education on the project evaluation team. The team met five times during 1986. The first meetings were devoted to the identification of skills, competencies and student performance standards appropriate to each level or sector of education, and to attempt to articulate a set of common performance standards representing the equivalent instruction at the high school and college levels.

The Project Manager and the Management Team, agreed that the FLIF Project should conduct a thorough statewide survey that would be sent to all nine state universities, the twenty-eight community colleges, and the public school districts. Dr. Ana Roca wrote the original survey, with the assistance of Dr. Rodolfo J. Cortina and the review and approval of the Management Team and the FLIF participants who had an opportunity to make suggestions concerning appropriate items to be included in the final versions of the survey to be sent to all levels of instruction.

The FLIF Survey results provided, for the first time in the history of foreign language training in Florida, up-to-date data. The results, together with the expertise input received from foreign language professionals, offer a sound basis for making solid policy recommendations to the various state agencies that can have an impact on the future of foreign language training in Florida.

Six task forces were created to develop recommendations relating to (1) identification of alternative means (tests) for assessing equivalency; (2) staff development; (3) improvements in instructional technology; (4) students who are speakers of a language other than English; (5) policy and funding needs for students of less commonly taught languages; and (6) articulation. These task forces met to analyze data and other and documentation. In December 1986, each task force completed its final recommendations with accompanying rationales. At that time, all project participants reviewed and approved each of the task force reports and recommendations.

An earlier draft of the report was submitted for consideration to the Office of the Commissioner, BOR, and SBCC in December, 1986. Dissemination of this revised and amplified version of the report to all Florida public institutions and to the foreign language professional community has been carried out by statewide mailing and by presentations at educational and public policy forums.

CHAPTER II
Status of Foreign Language Instruction

A. *FL Enrollment in Florida*

1. *The Public Schools*

Florida Public School enrollment in foreign language (FL) programs has seen a steady increase since the end of the last decade. At the Elementary School level (K-6) the increases went from 18,838 in 1979-80 to 80,377 in 1985-86, more than quadrupling the aggregate membership of FL classes. The Middle/Junior High School level (7-8) has risen in the same time span from 9,386 to 23,693. And this occurred while students reduced their participation in general language experience classes, thus increasing their direct subscription to classes which taught specific languages. At the Senior High School level (9-12) the figures from 1979-80 and 1985-86 were respectively 92,396 and 176,479 practically doubling in the seven year period. The total growth in FL for the Division of Public Schools (K-12) goes from 120,620 in 1979-80 to 280,549 in 1985-86. The trend is very clear: a slight reduction from 1979-80 to 1981-82 to a low 120,071, therefrom a marked increase of 29,000 and 29,000, 56,000 and 46,000 on subsequent years. (See Table 1).

2. *The Community Colleges*

Twenty-seven of the twenty-eight Florida Community Colleges offer foreign languages in 1983-84. That year the estimated head count enrollment reached 17,308. By 1985-86 all twenty-eight community colleges had FL programs albeit some were very small. The growth of FL enrollments at the community college level can be seen in the aggregate full time equivalent (F.T.E.) student-based on a 12 credit load. Since, however, Foreign Languages at the lower levels are not subscribed on an F.T.E. basis (because these courses are ordinarily offered on a prerequisite sequence, although occassionally one finds a total immersion course, offering 12 credits simultaneously over a period of a summer session, for example) we can estimate the probable head-count enrollment by multiplying F.T.E. aggregates by the 12 credit load implied. This procedure would yield a three year pattern as shown on the following table:

Table 2

	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86
FTE	1343	1322.6	1438.2
Estimated Headcount	16,116	15,872	17,271

If we check these figures against a telephone survey conducted for 1983-84 on specific headcount enrollment, however, we see that the actual headcount (17,308) is larger than that achieved by our estimation. For a language and college breakdown for 1983-84 see table 3.

3. *The State Universities*

The FL enrollment in Florida's state universities also shows a gradual increase in the number of students. Although two of the nine do not have a foreign language requirement in any shape or form even in the liberal arts, all nine showed an increase in the number of students taking foreign languages. The 1982-83 total for SUS, for example, was 10,733, which grew to 11,394 by 1983-84 and to 11,702 by 1984-85. The increases were not small, as in the case of the community colleges, nor dramatic as in the case of the public school enrollments. Clearly the post-secondary sector is in for a massive increase due to the wave effect on enrollment patterns. This does not take into consideration the newly-instituted FL requirement which will affect the post-secondary sector even more than has been the case.

In any case, the state universities will have an adjustment to make if the high school enrollments are projected into the future. For a three-year breakdown by university, see the following table which also contains the number of sections and an unduplicated faculty count:

Table 1

FL ENROLLMENTS IN FLORIDA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83	83-84	84-85	85-86
FL Elementary Schools	18,838	21,910	20,497	40,710	53,245	63,708	80,377
FL Middle Junior	4,820 4,566 9,386	3,011 4,756 7,767	2,435 6,698 9,133	1,767 8,385 10,152	1,396 7,459 8,855	2,201 6,542 8,743	2,147 21,546 23,693
FL Senior High School	92,396	91,806	90,441	98,818	116,195	161,622	176,479
TOTAL PS FL	120,620	121,483	120,071	149,680	178,295	234,073	280,549

Table 3
ESTIMATED HEADCOUNT
FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION
1983-84

COLLEGE	ARA	FRE	GER	HRB	ITA	JPN	LAT	POR	RUS	SPN	
Brevard		205	127							404	736
Broward	10	579	122	10		21		3		1500	2245
Central Florida			10							117	127
Chipola										56	56
Daytona Beach	11	97	42	2	14					214	380
Edison		49	33							206	288
Fla. JC @ Jax		212	54						27	323	616
Florida Keys		1			13					221	235
Gulf Coast		132								102	234
Hillsborough		103								579	682
Indian River		55	18							283	356
Lake City		35								74	109
Lake-Sumter		22								24	46
Manatee		133	139				23			241	536
Miami-Dade		1392	143	64	238				1	3615	5453
North Florida		15								20	35
Okaloosa-Walton		58	57							103	218
Palm Beach		288								603	891
Pasco-Hernando		9								40	49
Pensacola		235	107		25				32	249	648
Polk		31								155	186
St. Johns River											0
St. Petersburg		257	87							409	753
Santa Fe		326								485	811
Seminole		57	24							185	266
South Florida										33	33
Tallahassee		83	67							171	321
Valencia		231	91							676	998
TOTAL	21	4605	1121	76	290	21	23	3	60	11088	17308

Table 4

Foreign Languages
Count of Students, Faculty and Sections
By University and SUS Total
Fall 1983, Fall 1984 and Fall 1985

Student Headcount Enrollment

Term	SUS	UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
8-83	10733	3955	2628	155	1588	559	119	540	1139	50
8-84	11394	4512	2411	140	1384	824	206	531	1298	88
8-85	11702	4723	2320	203	1491	676	193	564	1433	99

Number of Course Sections

Term	SUS	UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
8-83	665	202	208	7	94	30	15	31	74	4
8-84	649	197	184	5	90	35	24	33	75	6
8-85	731	215	214	9	99	49	17	36	80	12

Unduplicated Count of Faculty

Term	SUS	UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
8-83	294	96	69	4	39	19	5	12	46	4
8-84	296	101	70	3	40	17	6	12	41	6
8-85	310	113	76	3	43	8	4	13	45	5

B. *Staffing for FL Programs in Florida*

The issue of staffing was of concern to the FLIF Project because it raises the questions of quantity and quality. The question of quantity addresses the critical shortage of FL teachers in the different educational sectors of the state. In the state universities the ratio of full time to part-time faculty is revealing as can be seen in the table that follows:

Table 5

UNIVERSITIES		FT (full-time)	AF (adj. fac.)	TA (teach.asst.)	FT/PT (full time /part time)	RATIO
UWF		5	0	0	5:0	5
FSU	Mod. Langs.	35	0	33	35:33	1
	Class. Langs.	9	1	8	9:9	1
UF	Roman. Langs.	27	6	40	27:46	.59
	Class. Langs.	8	2	2	8:4	2
	Germ./Slav.Langs.	13	5	6	13:11	1.18
	Asian/Afri.Langs.	6	1	5	6:6	1
FIU		15	38	0	15:38	.40
FAU		8	14	4	8:18	.44
UNF		2	5	0	2:5	.40
USF		18	11	18	18:29	.62
FAMU		2	1	0	2:1	2
UCF		7	8	0	7:8	.88

16

The table reveals that with few exceptions, FL students are receiving their instruction, for the most part, from non-full-time faculty. This is truer especially when one considers that the few F.T.E. faculty are usually engaged in upper-level and graduate instruction, research, and service activities which keep them away from lower-level language instruction.

In the community colleges the figures suggest that the implementation of the FL entrance requirement to Florida state universities will have a great impact on staff resources. Clearly there will have to be a plan to hire additional faculty in the FL area at all 28 community colleges.

The 67 school districts already face a critical teacher shortage for 1986-87 of 389 teachers. The number of teachers by headcount involves a duplication when principals count twice those teachers who teach two languages. The F.T.E. teachers, although not representing actual bodies because of part-time loading in the formula, represent a more accurate manner of measuring funding requirements for staffing needs. The following table shows the relationship between both:

Table 6

Florida Department of Education
Performance Standards/Personnel Data Section

Course Data Report of Students, Classes and Teachers
By Subject Area, Course and Grade

State Report

1985-86 School Year	Class Total	Class Out/Fld	Tchr Total	Tchr Out/Fld	Fte Total	Fte Out/Fld	Grade Level	Memb Ship
Total	8212	587	4360	347	1441.4	95.9		179121
State Total	13390	656	5993	389	2154.1	111.8		283321

C. *Relating Enrollment to Staffing*

The student/teacher ratios have three distinct treatments. At the community college level, the class size issue has not yet reached a critical stage as a general rule. At some individual colleges such as Miami Dade Community College, the issue may be more at hand than in most other colleges, but it has not created a statewide crisis at this time. Given the FL entrance requirement for state universities, however, the question must remain alive in the agenda of academic leaders when planning for faculty resources in the next few years.

At the state universities, the Board of Regents has taken prudent steps in reducing class size through board and legislative action via Specific Appropriation 520 which provided funds for reducing class size in English, Mathematics and Foreign Languages. The ratio of one teacher for each twenty-two students has been sought by injecting over $3 million and 56 positions toward this end in the budgets of each university as requested in individual plans. The following table shows the progress achieved so far in this regardby the SUS:

Table 7

	Fall 1983		Fall 1984		Fall 1985	
	Number sections	Average class size	Number sections	Average class size	Number sections	Average class size
FL	302	23	295	25	317	23

The careful monitoring by university officials figures in accordance with state mandates is useful, particularly because of the averaging of lower-level courses where student demand is the highest. For a more complete picture of the enrollment pattern, examine the following tables for each university:

Tables 8-17
Enrollment Figures and Number of Sections of Selected Lower Division Foreign Language Courses CLAST Comparison

Table 8

University of Florida

	Fall 1983		Fall 1984		Fall 1985	
Courses	Number Sections	Average Class Size	Number Sections	Average Class Size	Number Sections	Average Class Size
Foreign Language						
GER 1120	6	25	5	29	6	32
GER 1121	4	23	4	26	4	22
GER 1122	2	23	2	29	2	19
GER 1130	3	27	3	24	3	24
GER 1131	2	18	2	20	2	18
GER 2240	1	22	2	23	1	20
POL 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
POL 1122	-	-	-	-	-	-
POL 1130	-	-	-	-	-	-
POL 2210	-	-	-	-	-	-
RUS 1120	-	-	1	37	2	23
RUS 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
RUS 1122	-	-	-	-	-	-
RUS 1130	-	-	1	26	1	15
RUS 1131	-	-	1	8	1	5
RUS 2250	-	-	-	-	-	-
RUS 2266	-	-	1	15	1	12
RUS 2905	-	-	1	9	1	7
SCA 1120	-	-	1	17	-	-
SCA 1121	1	15	-	-	-	-
SCA 1122	-	-	-	-	1	12
FRE 1100	14	30	13	33	14	29
FRE 1110	1	13	1	22	1	11
FRE 1112	1	5	-	-	-	-
FRE 1121	2	24	2	25	2	26
FRE 1122	7	23	7	29	7	30
FRE 2200	2	31	2	33	3	28
FRE 2201	2	11	2	21	2	23
FRE 2240	3	19	2	29	2	35
FRE 2241	1	13	1	20	1	19
ITA 1120	2	34	2	38	2	38
ITA 1121	-	-	-	-	1	5
POR 1120	2	29	2	28	2	29
POR 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
SPN 1100	27	32	27	34	29	31
SPN 1121	2	33	2	32	2	33
SPN 1122	14	30	13	31	14	30
SPN 2030	-	-	-	-	-	-
SPN 2200	3	24	3	26	3	23
SPN 2201	1	14	1	24	1	32
SPN 2240	1	15	1	12	1	17

Table 8 (continued)

University of Florida

	Fall 1983		Fall 1984		Fall 1985	
Courses	Number Sections	Average Class Size	Number Sections	Average Class Size	Number Sections	Average Class Size
Foreign Language (continued)						
SPN 2440	1	15	1	14	-	-
LAT 1120	2	28	2	33	2	38
LAT 1121	-	-	-	-	1	24
LAT 1122	1	24	1	23	1	32
LAT 1131	1	27	2	22	1	13
LAT 1132	-	-	-	-	-	-
GRK 1130	-	-	1	30	1	21
GRK 1131	1	15	-	-	-	-
HBR 1120	2	25	2	25	3	24
HBR 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
HBR 2200	1	11	1	5	1	9
HBR 2201	-	-	-	-	-	-
ARA 1120	1	20	1	20	1	17
ARA 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
ARA 2201	1	4	1	10	1	3
ARA 2202	-	-	-	-	-	-
CHI 1120	1	21	1	30	1	34
CHI 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
CHI 2201	1	7	1	6	1	6
CHI 2202	-	-	-	-	-	-
JPN 1120	1	31	1	37	1	48
JPN 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
JPN 2201	1	12	1	9	1	11
JPN 2202	-	-	-	-	-	-
FRE 1112	1	5	-	-	-	-
FRE 1121	2	24	2	26	2	26
FRE 1122	7	23	7	29	7	30
FRE 2200	2	31	2	33	3	28
FRE 2201	2	11	2	21	2	23
FRE 2240	3	19	2	29	2	35
FRE 2241	1	13	1	20	1	19
ITA 1120	2	34	2	38	2	38
ITA 1121	-	-	-	-	1	5
POR 1120	2	29	2	28	2	29
POR 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
SPN 1100	27	32	27	34	29	31
SPN 1121	2	33	2	32	2	33
SPN 1122	14	30	13	31	14	30
SPN 2030	-	-	-	-	-	-
SPN 2200	3	24	3	26	3	23
SPN 2201	1	14	1	24	1	32
SPN 2240	1	15	1	12	1	17
SPN 2440	1	15	1	14	-	-

Table 8 (continued)

University of Florida

Courses	Fall 1983		Fall 1984		Fall 1985	
	Number Sections	Average Class Size	Number Sections	Average Class Size	Number Sections	Average Class Size
Foreign Language (continued)						
LAT 1120	2	28	2	33	2	38
LAT 1121	-	-	-	-	1	24
LAT 1122	1	24	1	23	1	32
LAT 1131	1	27	1	22	1	13
LAT 1132	-	-	-	-	-	-
GRK 1130	-	-	1	30	1	21
GRK 1131	1	15	-	-	-	-
HBR 1120	2	25	2	25	3	24
HBR 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
HBR 2200	1	11	1	5	1	9
HBR 2201	-	-	-	-	-	-
ARA 1120	1	20	1	20	1	17
ARA 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
ARA 2201	1	4	1	10	1	3
ARA 2202	-	-	-	-	-	-
CHI 1120	1	21	1	30	1	34
CHI 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
CHI 2201	1	7	1	6	1	6
CHI 2202	-	-	-	-	-	-
JPN 1120	1	31	1	37	1	48
JPN 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
JPN 2201	1	12	1	9	1	11
JPN 2202	-	-	-	-	-	-
SHO 1120	1	11	1	26	1	39
SHO 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
SHO 2201	-	-	-	-	-	-
SHO 2202	-	-	-	-	-	-
SWA 1120	1	9	1	12	1	32
SWA 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
SWA 2201	-	-	-	-	-	-
SWA 2202	-	-	-	-	-	-
YOR 1120	1	28	1	35	1	27
YOR 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
YOR 2201	-	-	-	-	-	-
YOR 2202	-	-	-	-	-	-
Avg. Language Total	122	26	123	28	131	27

Table 9

Florida State University

Courses	Fall 1983 Number Sections	Fall 1983 Average Class Size	Fall 1984 Number Sections	Fall 1984 Average Class Size	Fall 1985 Number Sections	Fall 1985 Average Class Size
Language						
GRE 1120	1	13	1	9	1	13
GRE 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
GRE 2230	1	5	1	5	1	5
HEB	1	12	-	-	1	14
HEB 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
HEB 2230	-	-	1	8	-	-
LAT 1120	2	16	2	23	2	18
LAT 1121	1	10	-	-	1	23
LAT 2230	1	12	1	10	1	14
CHI 1120	1	12	1	13	1	7
CHI 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
CHI 2200	1	8	1	7	1	6
FRE 1120	9	29	8	27	10	18
FRE 1121	7	21	5	23	8	17
FRE 2300	6	24	5	27	5	21
GER 1120	5	28	5	21	6	20
GER 1121	3	24	3	12	3	15
GER 2230 or	2	21	2	21	2	15
GER 2300	1	29		1	21	
ITA 1120	4	23	4	30	4	30
ITA 1121	2	13	3	10	3	10
ITA 2230 or	2	. 9	2	17	2	18
ITA 2300	-	-	-	-	-	-
JPN 1120	1	15	1	12	1	20
JPN 1121	-	-	-	-	-	-
JPN 2200	1	3	-	-	1	3
RUS 1120	2	16	2	11	2	14
RUS 1121	-	-	1	14	1	12
RUS 2200 or	1	15	1	10	1	15
RUS 2240	-	-	-	-		
SPN 1120	13	30	13	27	17	18
SPN 1121	6	31	8	23	9	17
SPN 2200	8	26	8	22	8	21
Avg. Language Total	82	22	79	22	93	18

Table 10

Florida A & M

	Fall 1983		Fall 1984		Fall 1985	
Courses	Number Sections	Average Class Size	Number Sections	Average Class Size	Number Sections	Average Class Size
Foreign Language						
SPN 1100	2	46	2	42	5	27
SPN 1101	-	-	-	-	-	-
SPN 2200	1	9	1	12	1	16
SPN 2201	-	-	-	-	-	-
FRE 1100	1	30	1	38	1	44
FRE 1101	-	-	-	-	-	-
FRE 2200	1	3	-	-	-	-
FRE 2201	-	-	-	-	-	-
Avg. Language Total	5	27	4	34	7	28

Table 11

University of South Florida

	Fall 1983		Fall 1984		Fall 1985	
Courses	Number Sections	Average Class Size	Number Sections	Average Class Size	Number Sections	Average Class Size
Language						
FRE 1060	1	9	1	20	1	20
FRE 1100	10	27	9	29	11	24
FRE 1101	1	17	1	6	1	24
FRE 2200	2	22	2	23	2	20
FRE 2201	1	11	-	-	1	12
GER 1100	4	27	4	26	3	30
GER 2200	1	26	1	16	1	30
GRE 1100	1	8	1	7	1	8
ITA 1100	2	31	2	30	2	30
ITA 1101	-	-	1	9	1	9
ITA 2200	1	13	1	7	-	-
LAT 1100	1	31	1	36	2	25
RUS 1100	1	28	1	20	1	24
SPN 1100	12	27	5	49	7	38
SPN 1101	1	19	1	10	1	36
SPN 2200	2	25	2	27	2	18
SPN 2201	1	23	1	21	1	12
Avg. Language Total	42	25	34	26	38	25

Table 12

Florida Atlantic University

Courses	Fall 1983		Fall 1984		Fall 1985	
	Number Sections	Average Class Size	Number Sections	Average Class Size	Number Sections	Average Class Size
Foreign Language	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 13

University of West Florida

Courses	Fall 1983		Fall 1984		Fall 1985	
	Number Sections	Average Class Size	Number Sections	Average Class Size	Number Sections	Average Class Size
Foreign Language						
FRE 1100	1	21	2	17	2	23
SPN 1100	1	21	3	25	2	26
Avg. Language Total	2	21	5	22	4	24

23

Table 14

University of Central Florida

Courses	Fall 1983 Number Sections	Fall 1983 Average Class Size	Fall 1984 Number Sections	Fall 1984 Average Class Size	Fall 1985 Number Sections	Fall 1985 Average Class Size
Foreign Language						
FRE 1100	3	23	2	32	-	-
FRE 1101	1	20	1	19	-	-
FRE 2200	1	25	1	23	1	24
GER 1005	1	11	-	-	-	-
GER 1100	1	34	1	29	-	-
GER 2200	1	9	1	13	1	12
ITA 1100	1	22	1	25	-	-
LAT 1100	1	9	1	11	-	-
RUS 1100	1	16	1	22	-	-
SPN 1100	4	25	3	29	-	-
SPN 1101	1	25	1	29	-	-
SPN 2230	1	23	1	14	1	25
ITA 1005	-	-	1	15	-	-
ITA 2200	-	-	1	12	-	-
RUS 2230	-	-	1	5	1	13
FRE 1005	-	-	-	-	1	14
FRE 1120	-	-	-	-	2	30
FRE 1121	-	-	-	-	1	20
GER 1120	-	-	-	-	1	31
ITA 1120	-	-	-	-	1	19
LAT 1120	-	-	-	-	1	18
RUS 1120	-	-	-	-	1	23
SPN 1120	-	-	-	-	3	36
SPN 1121	-	-	-	-	1	27
Avg. Language Total	17	21	17	22	16	24

Table 15

Florida International University

Courses	Fall 1983 Number Sections	Fall 1983 Average Class Size	Fall 1984 Number Sections	Fall 1984 Average Class Size	Fall 1985 Number Sections	Fall 1985 Average Class Size
Foreign Language						
FRE 1120	-	-	-	-	6	26
FRE 1121	-	-	-	-	4	16
FRE 1135	7	21	7	24	-	-
FRE 1136	4	16	4	20	-	-
SPN 1120	-	-	-	-	8	25
SPN 1121	-	-	-	-	5	18
SPN 1135	9	24	10	28	-	-
SPN 1136	8	10	6	14	-	-
Avg. Language Total	28	18	27	23	23	22

Table 16

University of North Florida

	Fall 1983		Fall 1984		Fall 1985	
Foreign Language*						
FRE 3120/2110	1	14	1	18	2	7
FRE 3121	-	-	1	14	-	-
SPN 3120/2120	-	-	1	19	2	8
SPN 3121	-	-	1	14	-	-
FOL 3930/2930	3	12	2	12	1	6
Avg. Language Total	4	13	6	15	5	7

*Foreign language courses at UNF were listed at the 3000 level through the 1984-85 academic year due to the university's former status as an upper division institution.

At the public schools, the FLIF Project focused on the high school enrollments to determine the class size for the first and second year courses. What follows is a breakdown by language showing courses, number of classes, number of students, average number of students per class, F.T.E. teachers (based on 1/125, a projection of F.T.E. teachers using 1/110 to achieve the class size of 22 , and the number of F.T.E. teachers needed. The cost of the program is computed thus: estimated number of teachers needed x F.T.E. x 22. Here it yields 190.87 x $2,013.10 x 22 = $8,453,288.10.

Table 17

Course	#of classes	#of students	Average #of students per class	FTE teachers 1/125	Projected FTE teachers 1/110	#of FTE teachers that will be needed
FRENCH I	894	22,091	24.71	176.72	200.82	24.10
" II	571	11,920	20.88	95.36	108.36	13.00
" III	227	3,043	13.41	24.34	27.66	3.32
" IV	123	751	6.11	6.01	6.83	0.82
" V	32	93	2.91	0.74	0.85	0.11
" VI	9	17	1.89	0.14	0.15	0.01
AP FR LANG.	35	261	7.57	2.09	2.37	0.28
AP FR LIT.	4	12	3.00	0.02	0.11	0.09
FRENCH TOTAL	1,895	38,188	20.15	305.50	347.16	41.66
GERMAM I	182	4,030	22.14	32.24	36.64	4.40
" II	135	2,165	16.04	17.32	19.68	2.36
" III	75	513	6.84	4.10	4.66	0.56
" IV	34	119	3.50	0.95	1.08	0.13
" V	5	5	1.00	0.04	0.05	0.01
" VI	1	1	1.00	0.01	0.01	0.00
AP GERMAN LANG.	12	60	5.00	0.48	0.55	0.07
GERMAN TOTAL	444	6,893	15.52	55.14	62.66	7.41
GREEK I	1	34	34.00	0.27	0.30	0.03
" II	1	18	18.00	0.14	0.16	0.02
" III	1	10	10.00	0.08	0.09	0.01
GREEK TOTAL	3	62	20.67	0.50	0.56	0.06

Table 17 (continued)

Course	#of classes	$of students	Average #of students per class	FTE teachers 1/125	Projected FTE teachers 1/110	#of FTE teachers that will be needed
HEBREW I	11	142	12.91	1.14	1.29	0.15
" II	9	71	7.89	0.57	0.65	0.08
" III	5	38	7.60	0.30	0.35	0.05
" IV	5	20	4.00	0.16	0.18	0.02
" V	1	5	5.00	0.04	0.05	0.01
HEBREW TOTAL	31	276	8.90	2.21	2.50	0.29
ITALIAN I	34	926	27.24	7.41	8.42	1.01
" II	23	350	15.22	2.80	3.18	0.38
" III	7	25	3.57	0.20	0.23	0.03
ITALIAN TOTAL	64	1,301	20.33	10.41	11.83	1.42
LATIN I	246	4,918	19.99	39.34	44.71	5.37
" II	176	2,717	15.44	21.74	24.70	2.96
" III	77	400	5.19	3.20	3.64	0.44
" IV	22	99	4.50	0.79	0.90	0.11
" V	2	3	1.50	0.02	0.03	0.01
AP LIT.	3	8	2.67	0.06	0.07	0.01
AP VERGIL	12	94	7.83	0.75	0.85	0.10
LATIN TOTAL	538	8,239	15.31	65.91	74.90	8.99
RUSSIAN I	12	126	10.50	1.01	1.15	0.14
" II	6	57	9.50	0.46	0.52	0.06
" III	3	24	8.00	0.19	0.22	0.03
" IV	3	10	3.33	0.08	0.09	0.01
RUSSIAN TOTAL	34	217	9.04	1.74	1.97	0.23

17 (continued)

Course	#of classes	#of students	Average #of students per class	FTE teachers 1/125	Projected FTE teachers 1/110	#of FTE teachers that will be needed
SPANISH I	2,426	64,364	26.53	514.91	585.13	70.22
" II	1,481	37,995	25.65	303.96	345.41	41.45
" III	410	8,098	19.75	64.78	73.62	8.84
" IV	170	2,164	12.73	17.31	19.67	2.36
" V	46	338	7.35	2.70	3.07	0.37
" VI	15	78	5.20	0.62	0.71	0.09
AP SP LANG.	75	817	10.89	6.54	7.43	0.89
AP SP LIT.	18	163	9.06	1.30	1.48	0.18
SPANISH TOTAL	4,640	114,017	24.57	912.14	1,036.52	124.38
SPAN-SP I	138	2,748	19.91	21.98	24.98	3.00
" II	83	1,777	21.41	14.22	16.15	1.93
" III	52	1,004	19.31	8.03	9.13	1.10
" IV	26	358	13.77	2.86	3.25	0.39
" V	10	44	4.40	0.35	0.40	0.05
SPAN-SP TOTAL	309	5,931	19.19	47.45	53.92	6.47

Note

1. Average in levels 1 & 2 are over 22 in most languages.

2. Average in levels 3 and beyond are not real because those classes are usually lumped together.

3. In the less commonly taught languages and in Classics, classes should remain small.

4. The estimated total cost can be reached through the formula:

   Estimated number of teachers needed x FTE x 22 =
   190.87 x $2,013.10 x 22 = $8,453,288.50

5. Weighted FTE = 125/110 = 1.14 FTE.

6. 191 teachers needed will not significantly affect the critical teacher shortage.

The issue of class size must be seen in the context of the unanimously-recommended minimum competencies. If the state expects to achieve these student performance standards in light of the current situation of FL programs at all levels of instruction in the state, improvements must be made in several areas. The state has already taken cognizance of the need for time on task; it now needs to address class size. The professionals involved in the Project, while recognizing other very important factors regarding staff development, assessment, instructional technology, attention to special category students and to classical and uncommonly taught languages, unanimously agreed that a class size of 22 was a minimum desideratum. This has already been approved by the BOR and funded by the State Legislature.

Foreign language professionals felt that their task in assisting students in the development of literacy through the study of a foreign language is no less onerous than that of English teachers, who currently enjoy a maximum of four (4) classes per day. The state should seriously consider whether this is not more productive in the secondary school foreign language program.

Whereas the maximum class size of twenty-two (22) students is necessary to establish a standard that responds to pedagogical exigencies as well as practical questions of funding capacities, the FLIF Project participants feel that it is also most necessary to advocate a minimum class size for certain languages. At a time when strategic and economic security considerations make it desirable for the U.S. to have its citizens be educated in critical languages, the State of Florida should foster their study by making tolerance limits flexible for languages such as Chinese, Japanese, Russian, Portuguese, Arabic, etc. by not cancelling classes with lower enrollments. A class size of 22 in Spanish or French should be comparable to a class size of 10-12 students, for example in Arabic or Chinese. The administrative provisions for this language policy must be also included in educational planning and management.

D. *Instructional Technology*

The FLIF Project surveyed all three educational sectors, public schools, community colleges, and state universities as to the capacity for enhancing foreign language instruction via the use of both the traditional language laboratory and the newer technologies. The results appear summarized in the following pages.

However, some trends need to be noted in this narrative report. First and foremost, instructional technology is in a sad state of need at every level and in every part of Florida. This is not to say that there are not initiatives in this area.

Public Schools

Symptomatic of the problem is the fact that less than 50% of the 67 Florida school districts returned the survey instrument. Of these only 5 were satisfied with their laboratory facilities and capacities. The story of lack of equipment, materials scheduling time, access, space is coupled with a plaint of outdated equipment, equipment in disrepair, or no equipment at all. Underlying these problems was the crying need for staff development in this area: equipment dismantled, not used, underutilized. Obviously the state needs to have a massive intervention in the acquisition, maintenance, supervision and training of instructors in the use of instructional technology *even for the optimum utilization of the traditional lab*. The area of newer technologies, it is evident from the data available to us, is somewhere in the future. It has not functionally entered the horizon of expectations of teachers in Florida's school districts. Careful planning and organization must be at the center of the state's efforts in this regard if children are to meet the student performance standards set by the new admission requirement to the state university system.

Community Colleges

All 28 Colleges responded to the survey questionaire. Six (6) of these expressed satisfaction with their laboratory facilities. For twenty-two (22) of the language laboratories echoed the complaints from the school districts: need for updating, expansion, repair, personnel, maintenance, permanent quarters, more software, for inter-active capacities, access, spaces or even a lab itself. Over twenty (20) colleges 20 do not use the computer in foreign language instruction. Only two (2) of the twenty-eight claim to use inter-active video technology, while only eight (8) use a video camera. The surprising fact, however, is that seventeen (17) do not even have a traditional audio language laboratory. The availability of technology is sporadic and indicative of a lack of systematic planning in this area. The need for equipment, personnel, materials, maintenance and training is evident throughout the state.

State Universities

Of the nine (9) state universities, two (2) do not have traditional language laboratory facilities. In four (4) the state of disrepair is critical because of obsolecence, non-maintenance, and overuse. In some campuses, the underutilization is due to the frustration expressed both in the survey and in oral reports with lack of funds for proper maintenance and supervision. When the use of lab facilities becomes voluntary, this is evidence of non-use because of lack of functionality. The number of stations in six (6) of the universities is insufficient for proper scheduling. Only two universities have a lab director who specializes in foreign languages, with most, having minimal and insufficient supervisory personnel for instruction. On the issue of the newer technologies, none have inter-active video; two use computers, three (3) a video camera, one has satellite TV, and none have adequate software. It is evident that the universities can hardly be expected to train teachers in technologies unavailable to their own institutions. Most universities are making a valiant effort in this regard because they are the key to changing the state's human resources in foreign language instruction.

E. *Language Assessment Instruments Used in Foreign Language Programs*

Results from the FLIF Project Survey provide, for the first time, valuable information regarding current practices in the assessment of a student's language abilities.

Out of the nine state universities, only four, Florida International University (FIU), University of South Florida (USF), University of Florida (UF), and University of West Florida (UWF), reported using any kind of a placement test at all. FIU and USF use teacher-made tests for placement purposes in Spanish and French. The University of Florida uses MLA tests for Spanish and French, but it also uses other tests, such as an oral interview for Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, Swahili, Shona, and Yoruba (Kwa),and for German, UF uses a commercial text, AATG - Am. Florida Atlantic University reports that it is in the process of norming recently-purchased tests for French, German, and Spanish. FSU, which generally does not use placement tests, but encourages students to take CLEP exams, uses a placement (department-made) test only in the case of Latin.

All nine state universities with the exception of the University of Central Florida claim to use some form of an informal interview, for a variety of languages, as a placement procedure. It should be noted that in most cases, this procedure takes place by arrangement through a faculty advisor, and is generally not carried out as a uniform procedure for all students who may need placement in the different languages offered at the various levels of instruction. In the case of native speakers of such languages as Spanish and French, four state universities reported that their placement procedures are based on a variety of procedures: teacher-made placement, an informal interview, and/or reviewing academic records of the students. At FSU, the policy consists of excluding literate native speakers from 1000 and 2000 level courses. FSU does not, however, use a formal placement test. Proficiency and placement, they claim, is based on an informal interview, depending on need.

A total of five universities claim to use some form of proficiency testing in their curriculum: FAU, USF, UF, FAMU, and UCF. The University of Florida reports the use of a department-made test and an abbreviated form of the oral proficiency interview administered to second semester students in Spanish and French; a teacher-made test is used in other languages, and the ACTFL oral proficiency interview will be used when guidelines are made available. FAU uses department-made tests for all languages offered; USF also uses department-made tests (for Spanish, Italian, and German), but a commercially-available test is used for German and Russian. FAMU reports the use of a teacher-made test for Spanish; UCF primarily uses the ETS MAPS tests for Spanish, French, Chinese, Hebrew, German, Italian, Russian, and Latin. FSU uses a department-made reading proficiency test for Latin and Classical Greek.

Regarding a student's possibility of receiving credit by exam, FIU, FAU, UNF, UF, UCF, UWF, and FSU, reported positively to the question: "Does your department offer credit by exam?" FSU only allows it for Latin; FIU will grant credit by exam in upper level language courses only through permission of the instructor and the chair. The University of North Florida reported that they grant credit through CLEP and Advanced Placement. FAU, USF, UF, FAM do not offer credit by exam; FAU, however, allows students to take the CLEP.

With respect to the issue of having a policy or a procedure for exempting students from the foreign language requirement at state universities. Three universities reported that they do not have such a procedure or policy: USF, UCF, and FSU; FAM answered "N/A" (not applicable). FSU makes an exception for disabled students, and in such a case, a waiver of the requirement can be granted by the Dean of Arts & Sciences.

Those universities which have a procedure or a policy for exempting students from the language requirement use a variety of exemption standards or policies. For example, FIU relies on a placement/achievement test which can allow a student to have full or partial exemption from the FL University program exit requirement. FAU bases exemption on 1) passing a reading proficiency test administered to transfer students; 2) evaluation of transcripts; and 3) on proof of 4 years of secondary level education experience in the country where the language is spoken. The University of North Florida is developing a proficiency test policy which they hope will be in additional foreign language. The University of Florida exempts students who are on par with the final exam given in 1121 (the second course of the elementary language sequence); the Advanced Placement is also accepted for exemption. The University of West Florida's policy exempts freshmen who can demonstrate that they've had 2 years of study of a modern foreign language during high school.

Florida's community colleges, in general, according to the data obtained through the survey, are not using placement testing procedures. Out of all the responses, 19 indicated that no placement text was being used. Among those who reported using placement testing of some type, Miami Dade Community College reported using an informal oral interview for placement purposes for all languages taught. The South Campus reported using a 15-minute version of the ACTFL oral proficiency interview. Daytona Beach Community College reported using a department-made placement text in Spanish and in French. Pensacola uses a 15-minute informal interview in French. Tallahassee uses a similar procedure for placement in French, German, and Spanish. In the case of perhaps the more thorny type of placement testing of native speakers of a language other than English, almost all community colleges reported not having a particular procedure for the placement of such students. In general terms, placement testing as well as proficiency testing, is done on an informal basis, most probably, through individual advising of students on a one to one basis. However, the majority of the colleges reported that they do not use any kind of placement text of informal interview.

F. *Teaching Approaches in FL Programs*

1. *Methodologies*

The FLIF Survey attempted to find out which teaching approaches institutions claim to use in the teaching of foreign languages. The respondents were asked to check (✓) the teaching approach that best described the approach used at their institution (department). The checklist included a variety of choices from the traditional methods like the grammar-translation method and the ALM, to the more recent Notional/Functional Approach and others. The checklist also included the option to describe an approach or method not included in the list.

The FIU response shows that they have an eclectic approach. It also specified that while some instructors emphasize a grammar-based approach, others emphasize the development of conversational skills. FAU reports using the communicative approach; FAMU and UCF claim to use the ALM. FAMU also indicates the use of a grammar-translation method; UCF combines ALM with a communicative approach. USF claims to use the notional/functional and the ALM; UNF is the only university which reported, among other methods, the use of TPR (Total Physical Response) method. UWF, like FIU, claims to use an eclectic approach. FSU, like other universities, uses ALM, but the Classics Department uses the grammar-translation method. UF reported to use all of the following approaches: notional/functional, grammar-translation, eclectic approach, modified four-skill approach, and the communicative approach.

As in the case of the state universities, the community colleges report the use of a number of various teaching approaches. Miami Dade Community College and Valencia Community College reported using an eclectic approach. Many other colleges also chose to describe their method of teaching as *eclectic*. Among these, Chipola, Indian River, Lake Sumter, Seminole, and others. Some colleges chose to check several approaches listed in the checklist. At first, in some cases, as in the case of Indian River, which checked 5 different teaching approaches, one could be somewhat confused at the response reported, as some of the approaches claimed are not quite compatible (e.g., grammar-translation and communicative). However, it could be that the person filling out the survey was answering in terms of different approaches used by different instructors teaching a number of different languages.

What we can conclude from the data obtained through the FLIF Survey, is that quite a range of teaching methodologies and approaches are in use in the different public institutions. These range from the most traditional approaches, such as the grammar-translation method, to the more recent notional/functional and communicative approaches. The more avant-garde approaches such as Suggestopedia, the Rassias Method, and the Silent Approach, are not popular, except perhaps on an individual or experimental basis.

2. *Faculty Development*

a. *Financial Support for Faculty Development*

The FLIF Survey also addressed certain questions regarding financial support for faculty development, areas of need for faculty development, and available resources and expertise in the different languages and in teaching approaches. Some universities, such as Florida Atlantic University and the University of Central Florida, reported that they do not have a policy to support faculty participation in professional meetings. Most, however, reported that they do have a policy to support faculty participation in professional meetings (e.g., FIU, FAMU, USF, FSU, UF). Some universities, though, are concerned about the lack of sufficient funds to be able to make use of the policy. The University of South Florida, for instance, has a policy which would support faculty to travel to meetings for professional development, but they report too that they "never have sufficient money to implement it." Florida State University has a supportive policy too, but faculty will be given financial funds to travel to a meeting only if presenting a paper or chairing a session. The University of Florida also reports to have a supportive policy, but the professional meeting must relate to their programs. At the University of West Florida, travel funds are granted through an application, and are handled on a case by case basis.

In the case of the community colleges, most respondents answered affirmatively regarding the availability of a policy to support faculty to travel to professional meetings. Some colleges specified the meetings which their faculty chose to attend (e.g., of these are the FFLA, SAMLA, AATG, ACTFL, AATSP, AATI, and the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages). Seminole reports to be able to choose to send its faculty to any language meeting except those abroad. One particular college, Lake Sumter, responded: "Yes, I have financial support from the college, but I don't choose to attend these meetings."

The public schools data indicates that the majority of the school districts reported the availability of some funds to attend professional meetings. However, some districts, such as Pasco County, Putnam, Columbia, and Alachua, reported not having funding available for professional meetings. Even those counties reporting the availability of funds, have limited funds for a handful of teachers, as finding appropriate substitutes to cover classes while faculty attend a meeting, can be both difficult and costly.

b. *Areas of Need for Faculty Development and Expertise in Professional Language Areas*

The state universities, the community colleges, and the public schools, identified similar areas in students. Many districts (e.g. Lake, Pasco, Mario, Gulf) are very concerned about the current shortage of qualified foreign language teachers to meet their program needs.

The community colleges are concerned with articulation of high school units and community college credits, the mechanics of checking students records, inadequate staffing, and a lack of standardization in the programs. Valencia claims, as others, to need more full-time faculty in order to meet its needs. Kent, among other things, is concerned with the need to re-train some of its adjunct faculty. Brevard, as others, is concerned about the lack of standardization and equivalency of credit for various levels, as some colleges offer 3-credit hour courses and others offer 4 credit hour courses. North Florida is concerned about staffing needs; several colleges are concerned about problems related to motivation on the part of the students.

The public schools are not less worried about similar problems. Orange County is concerned about reluctant students. However, although the schools are concerned about a variety of issues, the greatest concerns are: 1) overcrowded classes; and 2) an already-existing shortage of qualified, certified language teachers.

The universities and the colleges were asked to describe any changes which they hope will take place within the next two years. Six of the nine state universities explained that they are in the process of *upgrading* their foreign language exit requirement for certain programs. These universities are: FIU, FAU, USF, FAMU, UWF, and FSU. The notion is that if in theory, students will be admitted with 2 units (years) of high school study of a foreign language (or its equivalent, 8-10 credits), then the universities may wish to revise their language requirement. At FIU, for example, where the program requirement is 10 credits (elementary level), the requirement might change, if approved, to 5 or perhaps 10 credits (the same number of credits as before) at the *intermediate* level (2000-level) of instruction.

FAMU hopes to institute a 2-year requirement for all students in the College of Arts & Sciences. FAU has already taken steps toward the same goal; and FSU is in that process through its leadership in the Department of Foreign Languages. If the universities succeed in upgrading the exit requirements of some of their programs, this will mean that Florida universities will be responding to the many commissions which have called for a renewal and a strengthening of foreign language studies in order to better serve the nation's needs. Since students who enter Florida's universities will be coming in with an elementary-level knowledge of a foreign language, and since the universities claim, in general to be in the process of upgrading their exit requirements, we can foresee that intermediate and upper-level classes, which traditionally have had lower enrollments, will be offered and will not be in jeopardy of cancellation. We could also foresee that as foreign language skills continue to be viewed in the 1980's and 1990's as marketable and practical skills, perhaps more college students may decide to continue their FL study well beyond the 2000-level courses. Perhaps an encouraging factor is the fact that public attitude concerning foreign language study seems to be positive now. In 1979 a study funded by several agencies (e.g., the Ford Foundation, the Office of Education, the MLA, and others), found that the American public was more receptive to the concept of foreign language study. Certainly this new attitude, if indeed true, will make the educational changes to come in Florida, smoother and welcome.

need of professional development. The vast majority of respondents, at the three levels of instruction, indicated a need for professional development in the area of teaching techniques. This enthusiastic response could indicate a willingness on the part of the faculty, to update their knowledge on teaching approaches and recent developments in language teaching through formal training workshops.

The second area in common of great interest to the schools, the universities, and the colleges, is the area of computers and other special equipment. Dade, Osceola, Columbia, Baker, and Hardee, are among the many school districts reporting an interest in receiving training in the use of computers in foreign language teaching.

Among other areas described by the survey respondents as areas in need of development, were the following: training in assessing the language competencies of students, the improvement of the curriculum, and the improvement of the language competencies of teachers themselves. The state universities and some of the community colleges were able to identify a number of individual faculty members who are qualified to conduct professional training workshops in a number of topics related to foreign languages and foreign language teaching.

G. *Other Issues*

1. *Areas of Concern*

The schools, the colleges, and the universities which responded to the FLIF questionnaire, had an opportunity to write in their particular concerns regarding the foreign language requirement and the possible problems that could come up in relation to the administration, the curriculum, and the placement of students.

The universities reported very different procedures, if any, regarding the assessment of native speakers of a language other than English. FIU uses an instructor/department-made placement exam for French and Spanish, or an informal 15-minute interview in order to recommend placement of such students. FAMU, on the other hand, has no assessment policy or procedure established, according to the survey response. At UCF, a native speaker or a near-native speaker is asked to substitute a literature course for the conversation course; students who were educated abroad, must consult with a counselor. At UNF, students whose native language is not English, are not required to take an additional language; an oral interview would be used for placement recommendations.

All institutions, at the various levels of instruction, indicated concern about a number of areas. A major concern of the majority of respondents is *class size*. Other major concerns are: 1) the need for faculty to become familiarized with innovative approaches to teaching and current trends in the theory of second language acquisition; 2) lack of training programs and staff development opportunities; 3) communication with colleagues concerning language teaching; and 4) salaries. Other concerns expressed have to do with the need to develop the curriculum for bilingual students (where applicable), and the lack of articulation transfer agreement with other institutions.

More specifically, besides class size,the schools in particular expressed concern regarding other issues, such as: teaching load, training of AP teachers, language labs, teachers currently teaching who do not have adequate speaking ability in the language they teach, and the need to update and develop certain courses.

2. *The Language Requirement*

The FLIF Survey specifically asked respondents to write in any possible problems visualized due to the new state requirement so that specific issues of concern could be identified and possibly resolved. The responses were varied as might be expected.

The schools responded in a variety of ways. According to the response by Leon County Schools, for example, there is a lack of adequate counseling in the middle and high schools. Students might wait to take language classes when they are more "mature". Pinellas County comments that "students who meet the requirement in the 9th and 10th grades may have a two-year lapse before admission to the university…Close coordination is needed." Lake is also concerned with reluctant

CHAPTER III
Reports & Recommendations

Articulation

Rationale

From the beginning of the project, all FLIF participants–prior to the formal appointment of an Articulation Task Force–worked on the key issue of establishing an articulation equivalency. We must recall that the state law requires that all students who wish to be admitted to a state university in Florida must have studied a foreign language for 2 years or have its equivalent. Obviously, the difficult task was to try to establish that equivalent.

Project participants worked in teams and considered the many factors that would affect the establishing of an agreed upon equivalency. The time ("seat time") spent studying a foreign language at the different levels of instruction was discussed by the group. For example, if a student studied 2 years of a language in the secondary schools, what is the "seat time" equivalent at the community college or university levels? A widespread notion used by some teachers for many years has been to equate 2 years of high school study to one (1) year of college-level study. But can such an equivalency be so easily established? The group was concerned with many other issues. For example, a college may consider its first year program to consist of a total of six credits (3 in the Fall and 3 in the Spring). Another college may consider its first year level as equivalent to 10 credits (5 taken in the first semester and 5 during the second). Can those two different "first years" really be "equivalent" when one student has had more "seat time", that is, more contact (credit) hours than the other?

Other issues were also raised, such as a student's motivation, individual differences in the rate of learning, variety in the effectiveness of teachers, class size, and the use of language laboratories and other technologies (e.g. computer-assisted learning).

The members of the project decided that although time is an essential factor, that it was not the only factor to be considered in the formulation of a recommendation to the State's Articulation Coordinating Committee. The group agreed that it had to look at the issue of foreign language competencies in order to see how these compared across the different levels of instruction.

The Process

Whereas the public schools already had established officially-adopted state curriculum frameworks which serve as guides to teachers regarding course expectancies, performance standards, and outcomes, the colleges and universities did not have these. The project representatives divided into sector groups in order to create working frameworks, or in the case of public schools, refine official curriculum frameworks that defined course standards. The representatives also congregated in three intersector groups (members of the colleges, universities, and schools). These groups attempted to establish minimum standards which related to a nationally-recognized FL proficiency scale. The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages/Educational Testing Service (ACTFL/ETS) Proficiency Scale, based on the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) Scale, was the only available yardstick. (See Appendix).

The following table indicates the approved levels based on the participants experience and expertise in language teaching

Correlation Between Outcomes and the ACFTL/ETS Proficiency Scale

Proficiency Standards Table

Skill Level	High School	Community College	University
Speaking			
I	novice-mid		
II	novice-high		
III	intermediate-low	SAME	SAME
IV	intermediate-mid		
Listening Comprehension			
I	novice-mid		
II	intermediate-low		
III	intermediate-mid	SAME	SAME
IV	intermediate-high		
Reading Comprehension			
I	novice-mid		
II	novice-high		
III	intermediate-low	SAME	SAME
IV	intermediate-high		
Writing			
I	novice-high		
II	intermediate-low	SAME	SAME
III	intermediate-mid		
IV	intermediate-high		

FLIF participants, working in three intersector teams, defined separately what they each thought was the credit hour equivalent to the 2 units of FL at the secondary level. These three groups made the following initial recommendations:

1) This first group decided that 8 to 12 credits of post-secondary would be a minimum comparable equivalent to the 2 units of FL secondary instruction;

2) This second group decided that 12 college credits would be the comparable minimum equivalent to the 2 FL units in secondary; and

3) This third group agreed that 8 to 12 college credits would be the comparable minimum equivalent to the 2 units at the high school level.

After these three recommendations were formally presented to all representatives, a motion was made and passed by the entire group:

In order to enter a State university a student must have two (2) sequential units of study in one foreign language in high school or eight to ten (8-10) semester credit hours of sequential study in one foreign language at the college level. By 1989 upon verification by the foreign language profession, the eight to ten (8-10) credit range will be adjusted up to a maximum of twelve (12) semester credit hours.

Recommendations

The appointed Articulation Task Force, together with the entire group of the project, in sum, recommends the following:

1. The FLIF Project participants recommend that the following General Minimum Proficiency Outcomes and Performance Standards be accepted:

MINIMUM GENERIC PROFICIENCY OUTCOMES

A. *Expected Minimum Outcomes in Modern Languages After Two High School Academic Credits or 8-10 College Credits.*

(1) The ability to understand, with some repetition, simple questions and statements.

(2) The ability to read and understand the information presented in a simple paragraph.

(3) The ability to pronounce the language well enough to be intelligible to native speakers.

(4) The ability to ask and answer questions and maintain a simple conversation in areas of immediate need on very familiar topics.

(5) The ability to deal with some everyday situations such as greetings, leave-takings, buying food, and asking directions.

(6) The ability to write a short paragraph on a familiar topic.

(7) The ability to demonstrate limited social competence in the foreign culture by showing comprehension of common rules of etiquette, customs and sensitivities, and a knowledge of contributions to the arts and humanities by speakers of the target language.

B. *Expected Minimum Outcomes in Classical Languages After Two High School Academic Credits or 8-10 College Credits*

Since Latin and Classical Greek stress reading and cultural skills rather than the speaking skills, the principal competencies are reading and knowledge of Roman and Greek culture as follows:

(1) The ability to read and understand materials ranging from low to medium levels of difficulty - (e.g., adapted texts).

(2) The ability to give a reasonably accurate account of the contents of the reading material by answering questions, paraphrasing, translating, and summarizing.

(3) The ability to demonstrate knowledge of history, culture, and contributions to the arts and humanities of ancient civilizations.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

(Please see sample FL Curriculum Framework which contains Student Performance Standards in the Appendix Section).

2. The FLIF participants recommend that the State accept the correlations previously agreed upon so that they can be used as *minimum* proficiency standards that would satisfy the entrance requirement to the state universities. However, these correlations were based on the teaching experience, expertise, and professional opinion of the participants of the project, not on research. The group therefore recommends that these correlations be verified by studies and by testing.

Correlation Between Outcomes and the ACFTL/ETS Proficiency Scale

Proficiency Standards Table

Skill Level	High School	Community College	University
Speaking			
I	novice-mid		
II	novice-high		
III	intermediate-low	SAME	SAME
IV	intermediate-mid		
Listening Comprehension			
I	novice-mid		
II	intermediate-low		
III	intermediate-mid	SAME	SAME
IV	intermediate-high		
Reading Comprehension			
I	novice-mid		
II	novice-high		
III	intermediate-low	SAME	SAME
IV	intermediate-high		
Writing			
I	novice-high		
II	intermediate-low	SAME	SAME
III	intermediate-mid		
IV	intermediate-high		

3. The project participants also recommend that the motion passed by the group be accepted by the Articulation Coordinating Committee. It is therefore recommended that in order to enter a State university, a student have the 2 sequential units of FL study, as mandated by law, or 8 to 10 college semester credit hours of sequential study in a foreign language, as a minimum. The FLIF Project also recommends that the 8 to 10 credit range, upon verification by the foreign language profession by 1989, be adjusted up to a maximum of twelve (12) semester credit hours as the comparable minimum equivalent to the 2 units of a sequential FL at the secondary level.
4. Finally, the participants recommend the creation of local articulation committees for foreign language instruction throughout the state.

Language Assessment

RATIONALE

This task force was formed to study the requirements established by state law under section 246.111(33), F.S. to report to the Articulation Coordinating Committee and other appropriate boards on an alternative means by which students can demonstrate equivalent foreign language competence to meet the foreign language requirement for admission to the state universities.

The Task Force assumed that the alternative means to course credit for meeting the two-year foreign language admissions requirement, mandated by the Legislature under Section 246.111(33), F.S., is the use of standardized tests. No other alternative could be identified by the Task Force. Further, it was assumed that the intent of the legislature is to have a uniform application statewide of the mandated university admissions requirement of two years of a foreign language or its equivalent.

While the Task Force was concerned with the need to look at testing as an alternative admissions procedure, it was also interested in looking at the broader purposes of assessment. Assessment procedures are used to place students in appropriate instruction and to certify or evaluate student performance during and at the end of instruction. There is a high priority to improve assessment instruments and procedures for the competency-based evaluation of student performance for placement and classroom purposes, especially with respect to the assessment of speaking and listening skills.

The Task Force concentrated on standardized tests which have been developed by national test publishers. Such tests have been validated in a wider variety of settings rather than just at a single institution. The Task Force agreed that the test(s) ultimately identified should be able to test numerous high school and college students on the speaking, listening, reading, and writing competencies identified through the FLIF Project.

STATUS

In order to determine whether existing tests meet the above criteria, the Task Force looked at a variety of sources. Task Force members collected test descriptions from standard reference works on psychometrics and received test descriptions from national test agencies.

After reviewing all available test descriptions, it was the opinion of the Task Force that there does not exist at this moment an ideal national standardized assessment battery which meets fully the most pressing need in Florida to assess language competence for the purposes of alternative university admissions. Also, there does not appear to be a test which meets completely the needs of institutions to make course placement decisions, nor the needs of faculty to make other kinds of classroom learning assessments. However, the College Board/ETS have such tests as the foreign language Advanced Placement tests and MAPS, which in many important respects come close to meeting the Task Forces criteria for a comprehensive testing program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The alternative means by which students can demonstrate equivalent foreign language competence to meet the foreign language requirement for admission to the state universities should be through the successful completion of approved assessment test(s).
2. Efforts should begin immediately to develop the test instrument(s).
3. Preferably, the test instrument(s) should be developed through a consortium of states similarly interested in statewide assessment, so that national comparison data potentially may be available and so that developmental costs may be shared.
4. The SBE, with the concurrence of the BOR and the SBCC, should establish, through statewide consensus, a set of uniform student performance standards for the skills/competencies to be assessed on the test(s) for determining the equivalent foreign language competence to meet the foreign language requirement for admission to the state universities, as well as for evaluating student performance, college place-

ment and other purposes such as awarding credit and certifying successful completion of foreign language instruction at secondary and post-secondary levels if possible.

5. The approved test instrument(s), referred to above, should be of similar design to the Advanced Placement Program tests of the College Board. The test should measure whether students are competent and proficient in listening, speaking, reading, and writing to the levels required to be equivalent of two years of sequential foreign language at the secondary school level. Furthermore, the test should be secure, affordable, easily administered, and rapidly scored at both the local and national levels.
6. The test instrument(s) should be available for statewide administration by August 1, 1989. This date is subject to revision depending on both human and fiscal resources.
7. In the interim, the MAPS test should be used to assess equivalency for University admission when the foreign language requirements have not been met (high-school or post-secondary).

PLAN OF IMPLEMENTATION

The Task Force recognized that the long range development of more ideal tests would take time and be well-supported financially. There has to be a short and long range strategy for developing an assessment program. Such an assessment program should evaluate only those things which can and will be taught by the faculty of the state(s). The performance standards set should be realistic and easily understood by all concerned, especially the students and faculty. The linkage between assessment and instruction should be kept central to the assessment program.

The test instrument(s) should be developed with the assistance of the College Board/Educational Testing Service. Any test instrument(s) developed by the College Board/Educational Testing Service through a consortium of states should be based upon statewide faculty consensus on the skills and competencies. If the test instrument(s) used for admission purposes cannot be used for placement, credit, or certification, then it is recommended that efforts begin as soon as possible to develop such tests , which would be made available to the institutions on a voluntary basis. The development of such tests would be of lesser priority, however, than that for an equivalency test.

While the development in the long range of a comprehensive foreign language assessment program is of high priority, it is recognized by the Task Force that, in the light of the time it will take to be developed, there is a need for an interim assessment procedure. The Task Force concluded that the Foreign Language MAPS (placement) test(s) published by the College Board/Educational Testing Service will meet our needs temporarily for assessing the equivalent learning to two years of high school for the listening and reading skills. The assessment of speaking and writing competence would be the responsibility of the institutions during the interim period.

The procedure should be approved by the SBE, upon the concurrence of the BOR and the SBCC. Uniform test performance standards for assessing equivalency on an interim basis should be approved at the state level.

The Commissioner of Education should appoint a task force of foreign language professionals as soon as possible to make recommendations by March 1, 1987, on how the interim procedure is to be implemented, including recommendations on how the costs are to be covered, statewide standards established, and administration carried out at the institutional level.

The Task Force recommends, however, that the FLIF Project be designated by the Commissioner of Education to work during the winter and spring of 1987 to make recommendations as to how the MAPS should be administered by the institutions and/or the testing agency to assure that appropriate security is maintained and other test administration policies, such as costs, dates, and appropriate performance standards, are delineated. Presumably, the SBE, upon the recommendation of the Articulation Coordinating Committee, will need to promulgate test policies and rules in order to implement the interim testing program on the same basis statewide.

After March 1, 1987, a continuing, state-level advisory body of foreign language leaders and professionals representative of all levels of education should be appointed by the Commissioner of Education to an advisory board of top foreign language professionals who would facilitate and assure the development of sound, instructionally related tests which best meet the needs of our state. The committee would make recommendations to the Articulation Coordinating Committee regarding the standards, content and design of the test(s) and, as needed, address funding or other test policy questions arising from the implementation of the program.

Staff Development

RATIONALE

Language learning is of an integrative nature. It combines the four skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing and relates them to culture. Language teachers must be proficient in all aspects of the language that they teach. A flexible and coordinated staff development program is essential to address the vastly differing needs of teachers at all levels of instruction. This program must also address the needs of native and non-native speakers of the language being taught. It will supplement rather than supplant existing staff development programs.

STATUS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

At the present time funding and activities in staff development are as follows:

1. The state universities individually determine staff development priorities and set funding for their own institutional staff.
2. The community colleges allocate up to 2% of the operating budget of the institution for staff development activities at the discretion of the individual college.
3. The school districts utilize the Teacher Education Centers (TEC), established by the legislature for staff development in the public schools, and individual districts set priorities in the distribution of TEC funds among the disciplines.

No coordination of resources and staff development programs exists among or within the three levels.

GOALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Establishment of a staff development resource center to serve the State of Florida. The center will coordinate, support and assist in the efforts to improve the linguistic, cultural, and pedagogical competencies of instructors (full and part-time, K-university) throughout the state, in the public and private sectors.

A. Structure of the Center

Personnel

An Executive Council made up of nine board members and an Executive Director will administer the Center. The council will be composed of three members from public schools, two from the community colleges, two from the state universities, one from the private educational sector, and one from business/ industry. The Executive Director will be an ex-officio non-voting member of the executive council.

A Chair will be elected for a two-year term. The board members will have three-year terms, starting with a one-third rotation of the Council during each of the first three years so that after this period only one third of the membership will be new annually.

The salaried staff of the Center will include the Executive Director, an assistant, and secretarial/clerical services.Those selected to manage the Center should be active at both regional and national levels, have a thorough understanding of the U.S. educational system (K-16), and have teaching experience at various levels. Expertise in the areas of applied linguistics, language pedagogy, testing and measurement, educational research design and statistics is highly desirable, as well as native or near-native proficiency in at least one foreign language.

Location

The Center may be housed at the Florida International University Center for Multilingual & Multicultural Studies.

It is essential that a regional coordinator be appointed in each of the five state-designated geographical areas. The regional coordinators will have the responsibilities of organizing and coordinating activities designed to meet staff development and informational needs in each of the five regions.

B. Objectives of the Center

1. to enhance the functional foreign language abilities of instructors in the areas of listening, reading, and writing, with particular emphasis on oral communication in the modern languages;
2. to enhance the instructor's awareness of cultural similarities and differences between the target language culture and that of the United States, as both knowledge of the culture and an understanding of behaviors appropriate to a particular culture are of importance;
3. to develop the instructor's understanding of current concepts and theories of those fields of linguistics that have direct implications for foreign language teaching and language acquisition;
4. to develop the instructor's understanding of the appropriate applications of the various instructional approaches utilized in the attainment of specified objectives in foreign language instruction;
5. to develop the assessment strategies of language instructors as these relate to the measurement of functional proficiency;
6. to provide for the collection and dissemination of information, and training in the area of the new instructional media, including the interactive video lab, the interactive video-disc, computer-assisted instruction, and the use of foreign radio and television broadcasts;
7. to address issues which are not directly related to Staff Development, but which affect foreign language instruction in the state (e.g., teacher certification requirements, study-abroad)

C. Functions of the Center

1. to provide a pool of qualified personnel to teach foreign languages;
2. to serve in an advisory capacity to the Florida Department of Education;
3. to enhance rather than replace resources already available;
4. to serve as a liaison among all levels of education: elementary, middle, junior and high school, community college, and university;
5. to provide in-service workshops, through regional centers, for improvement of F.L. instruction, e.g. linguistic and cultural skills, technology, methodology, and the evaluation/selection of instructional materials;
6. to create a lending resource library and media collection;
7. to serve as a clearinghouse for the dissemination of information and materials, e.g., scholarships, fellowships, course offerings, curriculum, special programs, state and federal grants, consultants, job availability, textbook evaluation, software, etc.);
8. to assist in the development and dissemination of pedagogical materials produced for the improvement of F.L. instruction;
9. to provide information on coordination of study-abroad programs;
10. to provide assistance to teacher-training institutes;
11. to assist in the preparation and writing of staff development components.
12. to establish a link with existing agencies such as the Florida Information Resource Network (FIRN), Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative, etc.

D. Funding of the Center

1. The Department of Education (DOE) should include in its legislative budget request, funds to support the establishment of the center.
2. The Center will continually seek funds from outside sources, such as the Ford Foundation, Exxon, the National Endowment for the Humanities with the possibility of matching funds through the legislature.
3. The Center will have fiscal autonomy of function in accordance with state guidelines.

Instructional Technology

RATIONALE

Instructional technology in language teaching involves the use of components of the traditional language laboratory, such as the audio-active student learning stations linked to a central console, films, filmstrips, as well as the newer technologies utilizing audio and video satellite communications, random access laser disks, voice synthesis and recognition devices, and computer-assisted instruction.

Instructional Technology does not include ways of teaching language. Although this technology may have some useful purpose in other fields, it does not lend itself to the human interaction so necessary for effective oral/aural language learning.

STATUS

At the meetings in July, September, October, and November, the Task Force on Instructional Technology considered several issues. Our concerns included the pressing needs for equipment at secondary schools, community college and university levels, as well as those needs of the state in planning for the improvement of foreign language instruction at all levels.

The Task Force decided to review some of the available resources in this area such as film libraries, software banks, regional tape collections (both audio and video) as well as other sources of materials for classroom enhancement. It considered the need for developing information networks for the efficient dissemination of such materials statewide at all levels.

The Task Force also heard a report from the Education Commissioner's Office as to the availability of two major statewide communication networks, The first one is the Florida Information Resource Network (FIRN) which connects the computers of state agencies and institutions for information sharing. The second one is the Florida Satellite Network (FSN) which is a system of satellite reception facilities at each of the state's 28 community colleges for the purpose of teleconferencing.

GOAL

The State of Florida, through its educational sectors, should initiate a twin program of capital acquisition and faculty development in instructional technology for the purpose of enhancing Florida FL classroom instruction and, therefore, better preparing Florida students to meet the expected performance standards. This can be accomplished via learning sessions which can take place in or outside the classroom, by engaging in the practice of pronunciation, the manipulation of structures, the review of vocabulary, the mastering of spelling conventions, and the exercise of other necessary skills. Cultural appreciation and cross-cultural understanding can be enhanced through the use of instructional technology as well.

RECOMMENDATIONS

These recommendations imply legislative commitments to fund reasonable requests for capital investment in the future of foreign language education in Florida. Such requests should be executed by the appropriate education officials in the State.

The Task Force on Instructional Technology recommends the following initiatives:

A. A periodic demonstration of hardware and software, primarily of computers, at a special statewide conference or meeting designed for teachers, administrators and legislators.

B. The design of plans for the five Florida educational regions for intensive staff development in the new technologies: its availability, development, and classroom or laboratory utilization. For ongoing staff development the Florida Satellite Network (FSN) might be used.

C. A statewide capital acquisition plan for hardware and accessorial equipment based on a standard of minimum equipment needs for instructional technology for each level on a per-student basis.

D. A statewide software bank for all levels of foreign language instruction for all languages taught in the three educational sectors, subject to copyright and/or license restrictions.

E. The development of a matrix of information for distribution to institutions for the efficient dissemination of available materials (films, videos, software, hardware, manuals, etc.)and their appropriateness. This information network would also allow for resource sharing in joint programs. The public educational institutions of the state should use the Florida Information Resource Network (FIRN) to disseminate their available materials. They should avail themselves of the services of Micro Project at USF-Tampa which reviews these materials. Arrangements should be also be made for the reviews of other instructional materials.

F. The design of a plan for use by the foreign language profession of available regional networks of electronic information delivery, such as computer networks, television systems, telephone & radio communications systems. Possible uses include the the Florida Satellite Network (FSN) for language assessment training or the FIRN for information sharing on available foreign study abroad programs.

Classical and Less Commonly Taught Languages

RATIONALE

In the near future the Classical and less-commonly-taught languages will play a much more vital role in the foreign language curriculum of all sectors of education than they have in the past. This change has already begun and is due mainly to the following factors:

The current trend of increased foreign language enrollment due to upgraded foreign language requirement is affecting all languages. Moreover, increased foreign language enrollment often raises enrollment levels beyond the margin of minimum enrollment and thus calls into existence new programs in less-commonly-taught languages or adds new courses and levels to existing programs in such languages.

The new "Back to Basics" movement, which brought about the present reevaluation of foreign language requirements, has particular significance for Latin and Greek, as educators are now in the process of rediscovering the link between general academic performance and training in these classical languages. Latin is now the third most commonly taught language in Florida high schools.

With the ever-increasing prominence of the Orient in virtually all domains of work affairs, there is a rapidly growing demand for skills in such languages as Japanese and Chinese. Within the next few decades these oriental languages may well become commonly taught languages in the Western world.

Educators and the general public, as well as the Defense Department, now seem to be aware of the nation's critical shortage of specialists in Russian and other East-European languages.

A. Status

The following statistics represent public secondary and post-secondary schools only. They do not appear to be complete and need to be up-dated more accurately, including the survey and assessment of the needs of the business community and governmental agencies for the less commonly taught languages.

Language Enrollments 1984-1985

Languages	**Public High School**	**Community Colleges**	**University**
Latin	9,255	23	x
Modern Greek	171	x	x
Classical Greek	x	x	x
Hebrew	194	76	x
Italian	1,007	290	x
Russian	164	60	x
Arabic	x	21	x
Portuguese	87	3	x
Japanese	x	21	x
Chinese	x	x	x
Slavic (not Russian)	x	x	x

x Indicates lack of statistics available, although college catalogues indicate a wide range of languages taught.

B. Availability of Teachers

Current evidence shows that needs for teachers are generally being met but with increasing difficulty. This situation could worsen with expected increases in student enrollment unless accurate records of current programs permit more accurate projection of future needs. Already, in some cases teachers who are not fully certified are being used in secondary schools, and programs in new languages or continuations of established programs are in jeopardy as a result of the unavailability and/or the retirement of teachers.

There is a need to develop a mechanism for special certification for native/near native speakers who have language competencies equivalent to those of teachers with degrees in foreign languages.

C. Articulation

Articulation within secondary programs and between secondary and post-secondary programs is markedly insufficient. Some of the problems encountered are:

1. Incomplete information available concerning which languages are being taught at various institutions.
2. Lack of developed course descriptions and course objectives for less commonly taught languages at all levels.
3. Lack of communication regarding course content and performance objectives among the three levels - secondary, community colleges, and universities.
4. Wide discrepancies in the number of semester hours credit given, particularly at the beginning levels, - in various languages at community colleges and universities throughout the state. These discrepancies complicate the process of establishing equivalencies.
5. Inconsistent placement and exemption policies (including AP Latin students) and inadequate testing instruments in community college and universities.

In addition, the Classical and some less commonly taught languages present unique problems in that the minimum performance standards accepted for Spanish, French, and German do not apply to them. For example, Latin and Classical Greek do not require the skills of listening and speaking; Russian and Chinese demand more years of study than French or Spanish to reach various levels of fluency.

D. Teaching Materials Available

A great variety of teaching materials - both core and ancillary - is available for the more commonly taught languages. The task force found that the same is true for Latin. An extremely wide range of materials, including courses taught by computer, is readily available in various parts of the country. Classical Greek materials seem fairly easy to find, but more information is needed (bibliography work) before the task force can comment on the availability of materials - both written and high tech - for other of the less commonly taught languages. Japanese and Chinese materials, for example, do appear difficult to locate.

E. Exemption and Placement for Students

The inconsistencies of exemption and placement in post secondary schools need to be examined. These seem to be closely tied to the problems of articulation mentioned earlier, especially the inconsistent placement policies (including for AP Latin) and inadequate testing instruments in community colleges and universities. A task force to deal with Special Category Students (i.e. native speakers, etc.) is already addressing a part of this problem.

F. Problems of Expansion

There is a reluctance to offer small classes because of cost. This particularly occurs in efforts to begin new programs and in advanced levels of established programs. A shortage of certified teachers may limit the availability of courses in secondary schools beyond the second year level. An actual lack of certified teachers exists in some languages. An absence of enrollment data from private schools and colleges and accurate data from public institutions makes evaluation and planning difficult. In addition, a lack of an articulated curriculum and a shortage of appropriate materials available in some less-commonly taught languages hinder students in moving from secondary schools through community colleges to universities.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

1. Revise funding formulas so that school systems and post-secondary institutions will be encouraged to offer small classes and possibly share teachers in less-commonly taught languages and in advanced levels of all languages.
2. Establish means for attracting and training teachers in Latin and less commonly taught languages. This might include regional institutes for teachers to update skills or to work on certification and/or a statewide placement service. Currently only the Classical Association of Florida maintains a statewide service, and that is only for teachers of Latin.
3. Establish committees by language made up of representatives from secondary schools, community colleges, and universities to address problems of articulation, such as uniform course descriptions, placement and exemption, and performance objectives.
4. Set up and implement mechanisms to insure communication among all levels. Allow for the special needs of the Classical and less commonly taught languages in developing proficiency standards.
6. Utilize resources of the newly established Department of International Education to help obtain bibliography of instructional materials currently available.

The Special Category Student

I. RATIONALE AND STATUS

Because in the state of Florida there are large numbers of students who have a considerable degree of fluency in a foreign language, the Foreign Language Instruction in Florida (FLIF) Project created the Special Category Student Task Force in order to address the needs of these special students and to make appropriate recommendations regarding the foreign language requirement. In South Florida, for instance, we can find a mixture of Spanish-speaking students, which includes not only those who are part of the large and varied migrations of the Cuban exiles and their now American-born children, but also Hispanics from other parts: the Caribbean, Venezuela, Colombia, Argentina, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and the American Southwest. Furthermore, in addition to the large numbers of Spanish-speaking residents in Florida, we find other groups who are native or near-native speakers of French (e.g. the Haitians), Vietnamese, and other foreign languages, as are the many international students who regularly come to Florida to study.

The international students from so many different regions of the world (e.g. India, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Germany, Spain, France, China, etc.) regularly enroll in the different sectors of both our public and private educational institutions. In addition, there are a number of students who have attained fluency in a foreign language through a study-abroad experience, through their parent's business(es), or military experience abroad, or, finally, through natural contact with the multilingual communities residing right here in the state of Florida. Therefore, this task Force has considered students who have acquired knowledge of and fluency in a foreign language through a natural environment and/or through formal training.

The special category students can be divided into two groups:

I) Those students who have graduated or will graduate from high school in the United States.

II) Those students who have graduated from high school outside the United States.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS AND PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION

In order to provide an alternative process for these special category students to meet the language requirement, this task force recommends that

A. Any *high school student* in Florida who falls under this special category may fulfill the state foreign language requirement by:

   1. taking a test equivalent to the first two years of a foreign language, including listening, speaking, reading, writing; or

   2. taking a language course at a level higher than the first two consecutive years in high school; for example, Level III, IV or higher, or by passing an appropriate course designed for students in this category, such as Spanish for Native Speakers, French for French Speakers, etc.

B. Any community college student in Florida who falls under this special category may fulfill the state foreign language requirement by:

   1. taking a test equivalent to the first two years of a foreign language, including listening, speaking, reading, writing, and culture; or

   2. taking and passing an appropriate credit, intermediate level course (e.g. 2000-level).

C. Students who have graduated from a high school in a country other than the United States may fulfill the state of Florida foreign language requirement upon presentation of completed high school transcript, and/or academic record from institutions attended in their country.

Resource-Requirement-Model

Inasmuch as there needs to be a professional set of standards for the different educational sectors to base their funding requests to the legislature, the following is a recommended standard for staffing and instructional technology.

Staffing

At the present time the class-size used in computing F.T.E. for the state universities is an average of 22. For the public schools it is 25. The community colleges have no policy on class size for foreign language instruction. Based on the returns from the statewide surveys, on the Foreign Language Review and on the consensus of the FLIF participants; the FLIF Project recommends *that a maximum class size of 22 be established*

established as policy for each sector of education particularly in levels I and II of instrucion. For the SUS the BOR has an allocation regarding class-size. The State Board of Community Colleges has indicated that heretofore their average class-size in foreign languages does not excede 22. For the Division of Public Schools the average class-sizes for levels I and II in most languages is over 22. The formula for estimating the cost for new teachers is as follows: Number of teachers X F.T.E. X 22. Based on our analysis of enrollment and current costs, the formula yields 190.87 X $2,013.10 X 22 = $8,453,288.70. The weighted F.T.E. is 125/110 = 1.14 F.T.E. for foreign languages. The 191 teachers needed will not significantly affect the critical teacher shortage.

Minimum Equipment Needs in Foreign Language Instruction on a Per-Student Basis

The projection of costs for a minimum equipment model is based on three factors which impinge on any such projections:

a) student enrollment in foreign language courses,

b) available scheduling time for most efficient use of such equipment,

c) necessary maintenance outlays for maximization of "up" time and minimization of "down" time.

Three levels of education are considered in the general foreign language instructional sector. Since the projections reflect only needs for beginning and intermediate instruction, high schools, community colleges and universities will be treated as a unit.

Cost Formula

a) Student Enrollment in all foreign languages: SE *(See below)

b) Available Scheduling time for most eficient use: 60 units per week: SH

c) Necessary maintenance outlays for maximum performance: 3 units/week (or 5% down-time): SF (Time Frame: one week) Formula for cost projection: SQ x ECF = M.E.N.

d) Equipment Cost Factor for each student/position unit based on current prices for audiovisual and computer hardware costs. Factored in also is the networking/console costs for each 30 student/positions.

e) Results of the formula on an institutional basis.

Formula for Cost Projection:

$$MEN = \frac{SE}{SH - (SHxSF)} \times ECF$$

*SE = Student Enrollment
ECF = Equipment Cost Factor (includes purchase, installation, maintenance)
MEN = Minimum Equipment Needs
SH = Scheduleable Hours
SF = Service Factor

In figuring E.C.F. three elements must be considered:

1) Purchase price
2) Installation price
3) Maintenance

The purchase price depends a great deal on the system adopted by the institution. The computer equipment should be of the quality of IBM Apple manufacturing standards. The audio and video equipment should have interactive capacity. Film, radio and telephone equipment depend on the linkages of regional networks and/or on the interface with computer and audio equipment. A 25% networking cost must be added to the student/position unit cost.

The installation price is a necessary element to consider if one has to avoid costly errors because of installation by non-technical personnel. Many times the vendor or distributor will include the installation in the sale price.

The service of purchased equipment must be of the uppermost concern by educational administrators and other state officials. Broken equipment is a waste of tax payer dollars, but most importantly of desired utilization of the equipment, not to speak of the double opportunity cost factor attributable to expended resources that could have been used elsewhere while the purchased equipment lies unused.

Example

A typical campus with a foreign language enrollment of 1,000 students with a schedule of 60 hours (9 a.m. to 5 p.m.) which decides on Apple IIs with a centralized corvus hard disk, interactive audio by Sony and some film showing equipment, will have the following profile:

$SE = 1000$
$SH = 40$
$SF = .05$
$ECF = 4000$

$$MEN = \frac{SE}{SH-(SH \times SF)} \times ECF$$

$$MEN = \frac{1000}{40-(40 \times .05)} \times 4000$$

MEN = $105,280
MENPSB = $105.28

The Minimum Equipment Need for such an institution will be $105.28 on a per-student basis.

CHAPTER IV

An Implementation Plan for the Improvement of Foreign Language Instruction in Florida at all levels

An Implementation Plan for the Improvement of Foreign Language Instruction in Florida at All Levels

In order to implement the recommendations contained in this report the following action agenda should be followed:

I. *For Action by the State Articulation Committee:*

A. The Commissioner of Education should appoint a task force of foreign language professionals as soon as possible to make recommendations by March 1, 1987, on how the interim procedure on language assessment is to be implemented, including recommendations on how the costs are to be covered, statewide standards established, and administration carried out at the institutional level. If it is acceptable to the Commissioner, the FLIF project would be available to fill the task force role.

B. After March 1, 1987, the Commissioner of Education should consider appointing a permanent state-level committee to oversee the implementation of the foreign language assessment program. The committee should be representative of members of the foreign language profession at all levels of education. This committee would make recommendations to the Articulation Coordinating Committee regarding the standards, content, and design of the test(s) and, as needed, address funding or other test policy questions arising from the implementation of the program.

II. *For Action by the State Articulation Committee*

The State Articulation Committee should receive the recommended equivalencies contained in this report and act on the recommendations.

III. *For Action by the Educational Sectors:*

Each sector should make use of the resource requirement model in the preparation of funding requests for the additional staff needs, and for the acquisition of instructional capital equipment.

In addition, all sectors should coordinate their requests for staff development.

The sectors should move to approve the recommendations contained in this report and to give it wide circulation.

IV. *For the Foreign Language Profession:*

The statewide organizations such as FFLA, FCOMME, AATG, AATSP, AATF, AATI, the Classical Association of Florida, etc., as well as regional or local organizations, such as the FL Association of Dade County Teachers, should have each of their boards endorse the recommendations contained in this report and disseminate it within their membership through meetings, newsletters, and direct circulation.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
107 W. Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301

October 17, 1986

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, Council of Presidents

FROM: Charles B. Reed

Charles B Reed

SUBJECT: Interpretation of 1986 Legislative Changes to 240.233 F.S. Concerning Admissions of Students to Universities

The 1986 Florida Legislature made several changes to Subsection (1) of 240.233 Florida Statutes concerning the admission of students to state universities. The purpose of this memorandum is to interpret these changes. A copy of the changes to 240.233 F.S. is attached.

In section (1) the Legislature has established the minimum academic requirements for undergraduate admission to a university. The Legislature has left to the Board of Regents and to the universities the ability to require more than these minimum requirements, as long as the minimums are met.

High School Diploma Required

The first minimum standard required by this law is that all undergraduate students admitted shall have received a high school diploma pursuant to 232.246 F.S. (which prescribes the course requirements for high school graduation), or its equivalent. Because this is a minimum requirement, the Board of Regents and the universities may establish higher

AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION—EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

University of Florida Gainesville • Florida State University Tallahassee • Florida A&M University Tallahassee • University of South Florida Tampa • Florida Atlantic University Boca Raton
University of West Florida Pensacola • University of Central Florida Orlando • University of North Florida Jacksonville • Florida International University Miami

requirements. The Board of Regents freshmen admissions policy does, in fact, require an applicant to have a high school diploma, or its equivalent. However, the Regents' policy also requires additional high school units above those required by 232.246 F.S. for high school graduation.

Two Units of Foreign Language Required

The second minimum standard required by the Legislature is that, effective August 1, 1989, all undergraduate students who are admitted to a university shall have earned two credits of sequential foreign language at the secondary level or the equivalent of such instruction at the postsecondary level. The Board of Regents already has rules in place which require that by August 1, 1987, all freshmen (F.A.C. 6C-6.002) and all undergraduate transfer students (F.A.C. 6C-6.04) admitted have two high school academic units in foreign language or the equivalent. We will keep the Regents' requirement for freshmen. Thus, beginning August 1, 1987, the universities will be in compliance with the second minimum standard now established by the Legislature for freshmen admissions. However, 6C-6.04 will be proposed for modification so that undergraduate transfer students from community colleges with A.A. degrees or from other institutions with 60 or more semester hours of transferable credit are not required to have two units in foreign language for admissions until August 1, 1989, as provided by the 1986 statutory amendments.

Two Groups Exempted from Foreign Language

The law specifically exempts two groups of undergraduate students from the foreign language requirement. The first exempt group includes those students who receive associate of arts degrees prior to September 1, 1987. The second group of exempted students includes those who enroll full-time in a program of studies leading to an associate of arts degree from a Florida community college prior to August 1, 1989, and who maintain continuous full-time enrollment until they are admitted to a university. Continuous full-time enrollment shall be defined as enrollment for a minimum of 24 credit hours during any two semesters and a related summer term. The credits may be of any type offered by a community college.

Foreign Language Required

With the Legislature's last change to this law, a new requirement for a state university has been established.

Beginning August 1, 1987, and continuing until August 1, 1989, any undergraduate transfer student admitted to a university who has not completed two credits of sequential foreign language at the secondary level or the equivalent of such instruction at the postsecondary level and who is not in one of the two previously described exempt groups, must earn such foreign language credits or the equivalent before they may be admitted to the upper division of the university. However, beginning August 1, 1989, all undergraduate students (freshmen and transfer students), who are not in one of the two exempt groups, must already have earned the equivalent of two credits of sequential foreign language at the secondary level before admission to a university.

Freshmen Exceptions to Foreign Language Requirement

Between August 1, 1987, and August 1, 1989, the universities will be able to admit some freshmen who don't have the required two credits of sequential foreign language, or the equivalent, under the alternative admissions section of the Board of Regents' freshmen admissions policy; i.e., 6C-6.002(3)(C). However, under the above quoted new law, these students will have to earn the equivalent foreign language credits by the 60 hour level.

CBR/cdt

Attachment

~~academic and medical records and may hear testimony relevant to the case. The committee may grant a waiver for one or more sections of the college-level communication and computation skills examination based on the results of its review.~~

~~Section 22. Subsection (1) of section 240.233, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:~~

240.233 Universities; admissions of students.--Each university shall govern admissions of students, subject to this section and rules of ~~minimum-standards-adopted-by~~ the Board of Regents ~~and-rules-of-the-State-Board-of-Education~~.

(1) Minimum academic ~~Each-university-shall-develop academic-standards-for-admission-to-the-university.--These~~ standards for undergraduate admission to a university shall include the requirements that:

(a) Students have ~~No-person-may-be-admitted,-enrolled, or-matriculated-who-has-not~~ received a high school diploma pursuant to s. 232.246, or its equivalent, except as provided in s. 240.115(3).

(b) Effective August 1, 1989, students have earned two credits of sequential foreign language at the secondary level or the equivalent of such instruction at the postsecondary level. Students who receive associate of arts degrees prior to September 1, 1987, or who enroll full-time in a program of studies leading to an associate of arts degree from a Florida community college prior to August 1, 1989; and maintain continuous full-time enrollment shall be exempt from this requirement. ~~Effective-August-1,-1987,-no-student-may-be enrolled-who-has-not-earned-two-credits-or-the-equivalent-in foreign-language.~~

(c) Any nonexempt student who enters a state university prior to August 1, 1989, and who has not completed two credits of sequential foreign language at the secondary level or the equivalent of such instruction at the postsecondary level shall earn such credits prior to admission to the upper-division of a state university.

Section 23. Section 246.013, Florida Statutes, is created to read:

246.013 Participation in the common course designation and numbering system.--Licensed, accredited nonpublic postsecondary colleges and accredited nonpublic postsecondary colleges exempt from state licensure pursuant to s. 246.085(2)(a) may participate in the common course designation and numbering system. The State Board of Education, in conjunction with the Board of Regents and State Board of Community Colleges, shall designate by rule the acceptable agencies by which colleges must be accredited in order to participate in the system. Participating colleges shall bear the costs associated with inclusion in the system. The department shall adopt a fee schedule that includes the expenses incurred through data processing, faculty task force travel and per diem, and staff and clerical support time.

Section 24. Subsection (4) of section 246.021, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

(7) Students who do not meet the systemwide criteria and who wish to enroll in courses but not degree programs at the post-baccalaureate level may enroll under the classification of special post-baccalaureate non-degree students. Universities wishing to admit special post-baccalaureate non-degree students to graduate degree programs after the students have satisfactorily completed a specified number of credits may do so provided that the number so admitted is included as part of the 10 percent exception, as defined in (6) above.

Specific Authority 240.209(1), (3)(m), 240.233 FS. Law Implemented 240.209(1), (3)(m), 240.227(8), 240.233 FS. History--Formerly 6C-2.43, 11-18-70, Amended 11-20-70, Amended and Renumbered 12-17-74, Amended 1-24-77, 2-28-78, 10-17-78, 8-11-85.

6C-6.04 Transfer Students--Undergraduate.

(1) Each university shall develop admission policies governing the acceptance of undergraduate transfer students. Exceptions may be made on an individual basis when a student, in the judgment of an appropriate university committee, can reasonably be expected to do satisfactory academic work in the program and institution to which admission is sought. Applicants must meet the following minimum requirements.

(a) Be in good standing and eligible to return to the last institution attended as a degree-seeking student,

(b) A grade point average of at least 2.0 on a 4.0 system on all college-level academic courses attempted,

(c) Completed two years of one foreign language in high school or two semesters or the equivalent of two semesters of one foreign language in the undergraduate institution attended, effective August 1, 1987.

(2) Transfer Credit

(a) Each university shall require applicants for transfer to submit complete academic transcripts from all institutions attended which shall list all courses for which the student was enrolled each term, the status in each course at the end of each term, all grades and credits awarded, and a statement explaining the grading policy of the institution.

(b) Each college-level academic course in which a grade of "D" or better was awarded shall be received, accepted and retained as part of the transferring student's record by the receiving university in order that the appropriate college may determine the additional courses needed for the baccalaureate degree. This rule does not remove the university's minimum upper division credit requirements for graduation, but it does permit Florida public community college transfer students to satisfy curriculum requirements on the basis of a minimum number of credit courses completed in excess of 64 academic semester hours, when such credits are applicable for the program the student is entering.

(c) College-level academic courses completed by a student at a regionally or nationally accredited collegiate institution prior to graduation from high school may be accepted for transfer by a university provided the courses are applicable to a degree program offered at that institution.

(d) Credit earned in an external degree program shall not be accepted for transfer to a university unless such credit was earned through a collegiate institution accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting association.

(e) College credits earned by high school or college students on the basis of the College Entrance Examination Board's Advanced Placement Program or College Level Examination Program (CLEP) shall be accepted for transfer by a university provided the scores attained by the student on these examinations meet the standards established by the institution for the award of credit to its native students.

(3) AA Degree Graduates from Florida Community Colleges and SUS Universities

(a) Admission of Associate of Arts degree graduates from Florida Community College and State University System institutions will be governed by the Articulation Agreement between the state universities and public junior colleges of Florida, as approved by the Board and the Board of Education.

(b) Within curriculum, space, and fiscal limitations, admission as a junior to the upper division of a university shall be granted to any graduate of a state approved Florida community college or SUS institution who has completed the university parallel program and received the Associate in Arts degree, provided the degree has been awarded on the basis of the following:

1. At least 60 semester hours of academic work exclusive of occupational courses and basic required physical education courses;

2. An approved general education program of at least 36 semester hours and;

3. A grade point average of at least 2.0 on a 4.0 system on all college level academic courses attempted, provided that only the final grade received in courses repeated by the student shall be used in computing the average.

(4) Transfers who have not received the AA Degree from Florida Community Colleges or SUS Institutions:

(a) In addition to the general requirements described in subsection (1) above, undergraduate transfer students who have not earned the AA degree from an approved Florida public institution and who seek admission to the lower division of a university should satisfy the same admission requirements as beginning freshmen.

(b) Except for special purpose programs approved by the Board transfer applicants for admission to the upper division of a university shall have completed the following:

1. At least 60 semester hours of transfer credit in college-level academic courses, exclusive of occupational courses and basic required physical education courses; and

2. The prerequisite courses listed by the upper division program to which admission is sought.

(5) Graduation Requirements--Each university shall determine when the student has met requirements for a degree.

(a) Florida community college and state university students who have been certified as having completed an approved general education program prior to transfer will be considered as having met the general education requirements of the receiving university.

(b) Courses in which "D" grades were earned prior to transfer will be treated as if the grades were earned at the receiving university. The department or college in which the student enrolls shall, at its discretion, determine whether or not courses in which a student received "D" grades may be used to satisfy requirements in the student's major field. The university awarding the bachelor's degree shall determine the courses in the major taken prior to transfer.

(c) The graduation requirements in effect at the receiving university at the time a student enrolls at a Florida community college shall apply to that student in the same manner that graduation requirements of the SUS university apply to its native students, provided the student has had continuous enrollment as defined in the SUS institution's catalog.
Specific Authority 240.209(1), (3)(m), 240.227(8), 240.233 FS. Law Implemented 240.209(1), (3)(m), 240.227(8), 240.233 FS. History--Formerly 6C-2.44 and 6C-2.45, 11-18-70, Amended 7-6-72, Amended and Renumbered 12-17-74, Amended 8-1-84, 8-11-85.

6C-6.05 Acceptance of College Credit by Examination.

(1) The universities shall accept College Level Examination Program or other approved standardized examinations for credit presented by students who are admitted and/or enrolled.

(a) In the case of the CLEP examination, cut-off scores or percentiles (whichever is appropriate), as well as the minimum amount of credit that will be awarded by universities shall be as specified in the Articulation Agreement between the Public Universities and Community Colleges.

Appendix B

ASSESSING THE CURRENT SITUATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN FLORIDA'S PUBLIC POST SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

Foreign Language Instruction in Florida Project

Dr. Ana Roca
Project Manager
Fall 1986

Project's Management Team:
Dr. Rodolfo J. Cortina
Dr. Angela Lupo-Anderson
Mrs. Wally Lyhskov
Dr. Paul Parker
Dr. Suzanne Richter
Mr. Gabriel Valdes

Project Director
Dr. Rodolfo J. Cortina

63

Note: For multicampus institutions, one form should be completed by each campus offering foreign language instruction.

FLIF SURVEY
Reporting Academic Year: 1985-1986

1. Name of Institution:____________________

   Name of person completing this this survey:

   ____

2. Position or title:

   ____

3. Mailing address:

   ____

   ____

4. Telephones: Local telephone ( )____________________
   Suncom ____________________

5. Name and work telephone of any colleague(s) who assisted in completing this form.

   ____

   ____

FLIF Survey

A. Enrollment Data

1. According to your records, has the number of credit hours produced through foreign language instruction increased or decreased during the 1985-1986 academic year?

______Yes, it has increased.
Estimated percentage increase:______

______No it has not increased.
Estimated percentage decrease:________

2. Please fill out the following grid for each foreign language offered by your institution: (See below)

	# of sections	Avg. Enroll. per section	# of part-time instructors	# of teaching assistants	# of full-time instructors
Arabic					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					
Chinese					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					
Classic Greek					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					

	# of sections	Avg. Enroll. per section	# of part-time instructors	# of teaching assistants	# of full-time instructors
French					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					
German					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					
Hebrew					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					
Hindi					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					
Italian					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					

	# of sections	Avg. Enroll. per section	# of part-time instructors	# of teaching assistants	# of full-time instructors
Japanese					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					
Latin					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					
Mandarin Chinese					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					
Modern Greek					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					
Polish					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					

	# of sections	Avg. Enroll. per section	# of part-time instructors	# of teaching assistants	# of full-time instructors
Portuguese					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					
Russian					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					
Slavic					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					
Spanish					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					
Spanish for Native Speakers					
1st course (Please specify level)					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					

	# of sections	Avg. Enroll. per section	# of part-time instructors	# of teaching assistants	# of full-time instructors
Swahili					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					
Vietnamese					
1st course					
2nd course					
3rd course					
4th course					

Total:

All Languages/All Courses____

B. Contact/Credit Hours
How do contact hours per week relate to credit awarded?

1. Elementary-level courses (1000 level courses)

____ Class hours plus _____ language lab hours=______ Total Credits

2. Intermediate-level courses (2000 level courses)

____ Class hours plus ____ language lab hours = _____ Total Credits

C. Instructors

1. How many instructors did your department have in 1985-1986?

   a. Full-time: ______________________________

   b. Part-time: ______________________________

   c. Teaching Assistants: ______________________________

2. How many sections of undergraduate language courses were taught by full-time instructors for all languages.

   Fall 1985 ______________________________

   Spring 1986 ______________________________

3. How many sections of undergraduate language courses were taught by part-time adjunct instructors for all languages.

   Fall 1985 ______________________________

   Spring 1986 ______________________________

4. Approximately how many sections of undergraduate language courses were taught by graduate teaching assistants?

   Fall 1985 ______________________________

   Spring 1986 ______________________________

5. What are the minimum requirements for part-time foreign language instructors?

   ____

   ____

6. What are the minimum requirements for foreign language teaching assistants?

   ____

   ____

   ____

   ____

7. What type of supervision and orientation regarding the program and departmental policies do teaching assistants and adjuncts receive?

____

____

8. How many office hours are graduate assistants required to keep per contact hour that they teach?

Comments: ____

____

9. Does your institution provide adequate office space for its teaching assistants and part-time faculty so that they can see their students, give make-ups, etc.?

Yes___ ___ No

10. What other support does your department offer part-time faculty (travel funds for professional development, etc.)?

____

____

____

____

____

____

D. Instructional Technology

Foreign Language Laboratory

1. Does your department have an audio language laboratory?

   ____ Yes ___ No

2. Is your lab audio only or audio-active (e.g. where student can hear his/her own voice)?______________________________

3. If you have a lab, how many stations are there?______________________
   How Many rooms?__________

   How many rooms and positions are available for class use?
   Rooms:______________ Positions:________________________

   How many rooms and positions are available for individual student use?
   Rooms:______________ Positions:________________________

4. Is your lab satisfactory for your current needs? Yes____ No____

   If you are not satisfied with your present language lab, please explain.

   ____

   ____

   ____

   ____

   ____

5. Our foreign language equipment was installed

   ____ (0-5 years ago)
   ____ (6-10 years ago)
   ____ (11-15 years ago)
   ____ (16 - ? years ago)

6. Some institutions obtain permission from publishers in order to duplicate language laboratory programs for students. Does your lab provide for this service? ____ Yes ____ No

7A. Is your language lab director a media specialist?

___ Yes ___ No

7B. Is your language lab director a foreign language specialist?

_____ Yes ____ No

8. Is your language lab director position a full-time position?

____ Yes _____ No

Comments: ____

____

____

9. Number of other foreign language lab personnel ____________________________.

10. Number of language lab student assistants ________________________________

11. Number of trained language lab monitors __________________________________

12. Do you use textbook tapes? ____ Yes ____ No
Do you use supplemental tapes? ____ Yes ____ No
Do you use cassettes? ____ Yes _____ No
Do you use reel to reel tapes? ____ Yes _____ No
Do you use other tapes? ____ Yes _____ No (Please describe)

____

____

13. If you have more than one campus, what is the language lab situation at your other campus?

____

____

____

____

14. What, if any, are the current/future plans regarding the updating of your language laboratory facilities?

____

____

____

E. Other Instructional Resources

1. Please check equipment, materials, and other resources utilized in your language programs:

___a. computers for foreign language instruction
  ___ Apple IIe,c ___ McIntosh
  ___ IBM ___ Other (Please specify)________________

___b. video recorders ___VHS, ___BETA, ___ U-Matic,
  ___Other (Please specify) ______________

___c. video cameras

___d. interactive video-disc system

___e. satellite T.V. language classes

___f. film projectors

___g. filmstrip projectors

___h. slide projectors

___i. opaque & overhead projectors

___j. other equipment; please describe

___k. television programs in the target language
  please specify the language(s): ______________________________

___l. radio programs in the target language
  please specify the language(s):________________________________

___m. foreign magazines

___n. foreign newspapers

___o. other realia (e.g., brochures, pictures, games, posters)

___p. foreign films

___q. native speakers of the target language

___r. commercially-produced video cassettes

___s. records/audio tapes

___t. other

2. If you use computer software, is it keyed to a textbook or is it used as supplemental material? Please explain:

____

____

3. Do you offer foreign language through study abroad programs?

____ Yes ____ No

If yes, a) in what countries____
b) in what languages____
c) are they offered for credit? __ Yes __ No

____

____

F. Student Assessment

Placement

1. Does your department use placement tests? ___ Yes ___ No

2. If your answer is yes, please check the type of test that you use for each language taught:

a. Language____________________
We use:

_______1) a teacher-made test
_______2) a department-made test
_______3) an oral interview
_______4) a commercially-produced test:____________________________
__________________________________ publisher____________________
_______5) other: (please specify)________________________________

b. Language____________________
We use:

_______1) a teacher-made test
_______2) a department-made test
_______3) an oral interview
_______4) a commercially-produced test:____________________________
__________________________________ publisher____________________
_______5) other: (please specify)________________________________

Please use the space below or the back if you need to add more information regarding other placement tests used for other languages.

3. If you use an oral interview for placement purposes, please answer the following questions for each language taught:

   a. Is it an informal or formal interview? (Please specify language)

      ____ Formal ____ Informal ____________________
      ____ ____ ____________________
      ____ ____ ____________________
      ____ ____ ____________________

   b. If you conduct formal oral examinations for placement purposes, which scale do you use? Please specify.

      ____ FSI
      ____ ETS/ACTFL
      ____ Other. Please specify ____________________

   c. Approximate lenght of formal interview____________________

4. What assessment procedures does your institution use in the placement of native speakers of a foreign language (e.g., French, Spanish, Vietnamese)?

Proficiency

5. Does your department use proficiency tests? ___ Yes ___ No

6. If you answered yes, please check the type of test that you use for each language tested:

   a. Language____________________
      We use:
      ______1) a teacher-made test
      ______2) a department-made test
      ______3) an oral interview
      ______4) a commercially-produced test:____________________
      ____________________ Publisher____________________
      ______5) Other. Please specify____________________

   b. Language____________________
      We use:
      ______1) a teacher-made test
      ______2) a department-made test
      ______3) an oral interview
      ______4) a commercially-produced test:____________________
      ____________________ Publisher____________________
      ______5) Other. Please specify____________________

Please use the back of this sheet if you need to add more information regarding proficiency tests used for other languages.

Achievement

7. Does your department use achievement tests? ___ Yes ___ No

8. If you ansered yes, please check the type of test that you use for each language tested:

a. Language______________________
We use:
_______1) a teacher-made test
_______2) a department-made test
_______3) an oral interview
_______4) a commercially-produced test:______________________

______________________________ Publisher:______________________

5) Other. Please specify______________________________

b. Language______________________
We use:
_______1) a teacher-made test
_______2) a department-made test
_______3) an oral interview
_______4) a commercially-produced test:______________________

______________________________ Publisher:______________________

Please use the back of this sheet if you need to add more information regarding achievement tests used for other languages.

9. Does your department offer credit by examination? Comment on how this process functions including cut off scores. Please feel free to use additional paper.

____

____

10a. Do you have a policy or a procedure for exempting students from the foreign languge requirement at your institution?

____

____

10b. If so, please explain what standards are used to determine exemption?

____

____

____

____

G. Teaching Approaches

1. Check the teaching approach that best describes that used in your department.

___a. Functional/Notional
___b. Cognitive
___c. Audiolingual
___d. Grammar/Translation
___e. Communicative
___f. Eclectic
___g. Natural Approach
___h. Silent Way
___i. TPR
___j. Others (Please Specify)

____

2. Does your institution have a policy which financially supports faculty attendance and participation in annual state, regional, national or international meetings dealing with foreign language teaching?

____ Yes   ___ No

If *yes*, please specify which meetings/organizations.

____

____

3. In your opinion, what professional workshops/training in foreign language teaching is needed by the foreign language faculty?

___a. teaching techniques
___b. student assessment/evaluation
___c. use of computers or other special equipment
___d. curriculum development
___e. language competencies
___f. literature competencies (For example: a French teacher whose training was in Italian etc.)
___g. other (please specify)______________________________

4. List any members of your department who might be qualified in offering professional development training. Please specify their area of pedagogical expertise.

a. ____
b. ____
c. ____
d. ____
e. ____
f. ____

H. Other Issues and Areas of Concern

1. Please indicate with a (✓) the level of concern regarding each of the following:

	Not too Concerned 1	2	3	Very Concerned 4	5
a. Class size					
b. Familiarization with innovative approaches to teaching and current theory of second lang. acquisition					
c. Lack of training programs and of staff development opportunities					
d Salaries					
e. Supervision					
f. Curriculum development					
g. Advanced classes					
h. Curriculum development for bilingual students					
i. Communication with colleagues concerning language teaching					
j. Lack of articulation transfer agreement with other institutions					
k. Other issues and concerns. Specify					

____

____

2. What assessment procedures or policy does your institution use in the placement of native speakers of a foreign language (e.g., Spanish, French, Hebrew, Vietnamese)? Please explain, including cut-off scores, if any.

____

____

____

____

____

4. Do you visualize any administrative, curricular, or pedagogical problems that may result in the foreign language entrance requirement to the state universities (Students who enter a state university must have two units of a single foreign language or its equivalent)? If your answer is yes, please write your comments below.

____

____

____

5. Do you expect to change the language requirement at your institution within the next two years.

Yes_________ No __________

7. If your answer is YES above, please describe in what way you hope to change the language requirement within the next two years.

____

____

____

8. Final Comments:

____

____

____

____

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this questionnaire.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN FLORIDA PROJECT

SCHOOL DISTRICT SURVEY

Reporting Academic Year: 1985-86

1. Name of School District: ______________________

   Name of person completing this survey: ______________________

2. Position or title: ______________________

3. Mailing address: ______________________

   ____

4. Telephone number: Local ( ) ______________________

   Suncom ______________________

5. Name and work telephone number of any other person(s) who may have assisted in completing this survey:

   ____

   ____

Please return survey by November 14, 1986

Dr. Rodolfo Cortina
FLIF Project Director
Primera Casa 538
Center for Multilingual and
Multicultural Studies
Florida International University
Tamiami Campus
Miami, Florida 33199

A. Instructional Technology

Foreign Language Laboratory

1. Does your district have audio language laboratories? Yes ____ No ____

2. If not in all schools, please explain how many have a laboratory and how many don't:

____

____

____

3. Are your labs audio only or audio-active (e.g., where student can hear his/her own voice)?

_____ Audio only
_____ Audio-active
_____ Our district has a combination

4. Average age of equipment:

_____ 1-5 years
_____ 6-10 years
_____ 11-15 years
_____ over 15 years

5. Are your language laboratory facilities adequate for your district's current needs? Yes ____ No ____

6. If the answer to #5 is "no," what is necessary in order to meet your district's needs? Please explain:

____

____

____

____

____

7. Our language laboratory facilities are used regularly by:

_____ all classes
_____ some classes
_____ very few classes
_____ no classes

82

B. Other Instructional Resources

1. Please indicate equipment, materials and other resources available to your foreign language program:

_____ computers or computer labs for foreign language instruction
_____ video recorders (VHS ____, BETA ____, other ____)
_____ video cameras
_____ TV monitors
_____ interactive video disk system
_____ film projectors
_____ filmstrip projectors
_____ slide projectors
_____ opaque and overhead projectors
_____ other equipment (please specify) ______________________________
____

_____ satellite TV language classes
_____ computer software
_____ recorded video programs
_____ foreign films
_____ filmstrips
_____ slides
_____ television programs in the target language (please specify) _________
____

_____ radio programs in the target language (please specify) ___________
____

_____ records/audio tapes (please specify) ________________________
____

_____ foreign magazines
_____ foreign newspapers
_____ other realia (e.g., brochures, pictures, games, posters)
_____ native speakers of the target language

2. If you use computer software, is it keyed to a textbook or is it used as supplemental material for practice? Please explain.

____
____
____
____
____
____
____

C. Teaching Approach

1. Check the approach that best describes the methodology used in your foreign language classes:

_____ Functional/Notional
_____ Cognitive
_____ Audiolingual
_____ Grammar/Translation
_____ Communicative
_____ Eclectic
_____ Other

2. Does your district have a policy which financially supports staff attendance at annual (national, regional or state) professional meetings dealing with foreign language teaching? Yes ____ No ____

Explain sources of funding:

____

____

____

3. What kind of professional development in foreign language teaching do you feel that your staff needs?

_____ teaching techniques
_____ assessment and evaluation
_____ use of computers or other special equipment
_____ curriculum development
_____ other (specify) ______________________________

____

D. Areas of Concern to Your Teachers

____

____

____

____

E. Do you visualize any problems that may result because of the foreign language entrance requirement to the state universities? If so, please write your comments below:

____

____

____

____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

Appendix C

MEMORANDUM

TO: ALL INTERESTED PERSONS DATE: February 19, 1986

FROM: THE MANAGEMENT TEAM AND THE PROJECT MANAGER,
FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN FLORIDA PROJECT (1986)

SUBJECT: INVITATION TO OPEN MEETINGS CONCERNING ALL LEVELS OF
FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

You are cordially invited to attend any of the following open meetings concerning the status of foreign language instruction in Florida and the existing problems regarding such matters as placement testing, curriculum design, and articulation of levels among the programs in the schools, community colleges, and the state universities. The meetings will take place in different regions of the State of Florida in order to gather information from different locations throughout the state. The first meeting will be in Miami, the second in Tallahassee, and the third in Orlando. The project's management team will be at each location from 10:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M. and all three meetings will be open to the public from 11:00 to 2:00 P.M.

We hope that you can attend. We value your opinions and the information that only you can provide us.

MEETING #1: MIAMI
February 24, 1986
Location: 9th Floor Conference Room
Dade County Public Schools Building
Local Contact Persons: Ana Roca, Coordinator, Spanish Language Program
Florida International University (554-2851), and Wally Lyshkov, Supervisor
of Foreign Language Instruction, Dade County Public Schools, (376-1961)

MEETING #2: TALLAHASSEE
February 25, 1986
Location: Collins Building, Room 326
Contact Person: Dave Ehlert, Program Support & Services,
Division of Community Colleges (Suncom 8-278-0555)

MEETING #3: ORLANDO
February 26, 1986
Location: Valencia Community College - Building 4, Room #104
Contact Person: Rosita Martinez, Foreign Languages,
(Suncom 398-5000 or (305)299-5000, Ext. 1300)

Appendix D

Foreign Language Instruction in Florida Project
Steering Committee Meeting

Friday, March 7, 1986; 10:00 A.M.-3:00 P.M.
Florida International University
PC 325

AGENDA

I. Call to Order

II. Review of the Project Goals & Objectives

III. Role of the Steering Committee

IV. Review of Agenda for April 8 & 9 Meeting

V. Consideration of May Agenda

VI. Consideration of Data for Cost Model

VII. Approval of Workplan

VIII. Adjournment

86

Foreign Language Instruction in Florida Project
Evaluation Teams Meeting
Court of Flags Hotel
Orlando, Florida

Agenda

Tuesday, April 8, 1986

Day 1 - SESSION 1

10:00 A.M.	Introduction Rodolfo Cortina
10:05 A.M.	Keynote Speech "Future of Foreign Language Education in Florida" Marshall Frinks
10:25 A.M.	Questions & Answers Rodolfo Cortina
10:35 A.M.	Overview of the Purpose and Objectives of the Project Paul Parker
10:50 A.M.	Explanation & assignments for sessions 2 & 3 Angela Lupo-Anderson
11:15 A.M.	Video Cassette Presentation. "Language Acquisition and Syllabus Design: Need for a Broad Perspective," by Renate Schultz, Ph.D. Ana Roca
12:30 P.M.	Lunch

Day 1 - SESSION 2

1:45 P.M. to 4:30 P.M.	Meetings of sector groups with specific assignments
4:30 P.M.	Reports with questions and answers Wally Lyshkov
5:00 P.M.	Organization of remainder of sessions Rodolfo Cortina

Wednesday, April 9, 1986

Day 2 - SESSION 3

8:45 A.M.	Travel reimbursement questions and answers Ana Roca/Maria Antonieta Garcia
9:00 A.M.	Meetings of intersector groups
11:00 A.M.	Reports of each group for agreement and final recommendations Suzanne Richter
12:00 P.M.	Recommendations Rodolfo Cortina

Day 2 - SESSION 4

12:30 P.M.	Lunch
1:30 P.M.	Video Cassette Presentation: Judy Liskin-Gasparro "Building a Proficiency-Oriented Language Program" Ana Roca
2:30 P.M.	Break
2:45 P.M.	Panel Discussion: Impact and implementation of the Florida Statute 240.233 (1) (b) Gabriel Valdes (moderator) Anthony Cervone, Rosita Martinez Wally Lyshkov, Ivy Mitchell, Ana Roca
3:30 P.M.	Preview of next meeting Angela Lupo-Anderson
4:00 P.M.	Adjourn

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN FLORIDA PROJECT
EVALUATION TEAM MEETING #2
MAY 14-16, 1986
SHERATON RIVER HOUSE HOTEL
MIAMI, FLORIDA

MAY 14, 1986

1:00 p.m.	Working Meeting Board Room #310 Community College Sector Group

MAY 15, 1986

10:00-10:15 a.m.	GENERAL SESSION: Welcoming Remarks and Update Deco Room #1 Ana Roca, Project Manager Rodolfo Cortina, Project Director
10:15-12:30 p.m.	MEETINGS OF SECTOR GROUPS Deco Room #1: Public Schools Deco Room #2: Community Colleges Deco Room #3: State Universities Topics for Discussion: Curriculum Frameworks, Proficiency Levels, Equivalencies, and Minimum Contact Hours
12:30-1:45 p.m.	Lunch at Daphne's
2:00-3:30 p.m.	MEETINGS OF SECTOR GROUPS CONTINUE
3:30-3:45 p.m.	INFORMAL BREAK
3:45-5:00 p.m.	MEETINGS OF SECTOR GROUPS CONTINUE AND CONCLUDE AT 5:00 P.M.
5:00-5:30 p.m.	SUMMARY AND REPORTS FROM EACH OF THE SECTOR GROUPS Deco Room #1 Instructions for Intersector Group Meetings Tomorrow, May 16

MAY 16, 1986

8:45-9:00 a.m.	REVIEW OF TASKS
9:00-10:30 a.m.	CONCURRENT SESSIONS OF INTERSECTOR GROUPS Deco Room #1: Public Schools Deco Room #2: Community Colleges Deco Room #3: State Universities
10:30-10:45 a.m.	Informal Break
10:45-12:00 p.m.	CONCURRENT SESSIONS OF INTERSECTOR GROUPS CONTINUE
12:00-1:15 p.m.	Lunch at Daphne's (Check out time is: 12:00 NOON)
1:45-3:30 p.m.	CONCURRENT SESSIONS OF INTERSECTOR GROUPS CONTINUE
3:30-3:45 p.m.	Informal Break
3:45-4:30 p.m.	FINAL MEETING OF SECTOR GROUPS Reports and Discussion of Issues and Recommendations
4:30-5:00 p.m.	GENERAL SESSION: REPORTS, SUMMARY, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE EVALUATION TEAMS REGARDING EQUIVALENCIES, CONTACT HOURS, AND OTHER ARTICULATION-RELATED ISSUES

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN FLORIDA PROJECT
Summer Meeting of Task Forces
July 23-24, 1986

HOLIDAY INN BRICKELL POINT ON BISCAYNE BAY
495 Brickell Avenue
Miami, Florida 33131
305-373-6000 or 1-800-238-8000

WEDNESDAY, JULY 23, 1986

10:00 A.M.-10:30 A.M.	GENERAL SESSION: ASSIGNMENT OF TASK FORCES NASSAU ROOM
10:30 A.M.-12:30 P.M.	TASK FORCE SESSIONS: ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING OF ISSUES & INFORMATION #1 Instructional Technology Boardroom "A" #2 Language Assessment Boardroom C #3 Staff Development Bogota Meeting Room #4 The Special Category Student Kingston Meeting Room #5 Classical and Less-Commonly Taught Languages Kingston Meeting Room
12:30 P.M.- 2:00 P.M.	LUNCH BREAK
2:00 P.M.- 3:30 P.M.	WORKING MEETINGS OF THE TASK FORCES: STATEWIDE SURVEY
3:30 P.M.- 3:45 P.M.	Informal Break
3:45 P.M.- 5:00 P.M.	WORKING MEETINGS OF TASK FORCES CONTINUE
5:00 P.M.	BREAK Note: Task Forces may continue working after five if they need to do so.

Meeting Rooms are only tentatively-assigned by the hotel and are subject to change by the management. If there are any changes made, those changes will be posted by the hotel staff.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN FLORIDA PROJECT
Summer Meeting of the Task Forces

HOLIDAY INN BRICKELL POINT ON BISCAYNE BAY
495 Brickell Avenue
Miami, Florida 33131
305-373-6000 or 1-800-238-8000

THURSDAY, JULY 24, 1986

9:00 A.M. - 11:30 A.M.	WORKING MEETINGS OF THE VARIOUS TASK FORCES CONTINUE: REQUEST FOR INFORMATION OTHER THAN SURVEY
11:30 A.M. - 1:30 P.M.	BREAK FOR CHECKOUT OF THE HOTEL AND FOR LUNCH
1:30 P.M. - 3:00 P.M.	WORKING MEETINGS CONTINUE: CONSIDERATION OF OTHER ISSUES
3:00 P.M. - 4:00 P.M.	GENERAL SESSION & REPORTS BRASILIA ROOM
4:00 P.M.	ADJOURNMENT

THANK YOU!

Please remember to send your receipts and relevant information to:

Ms. Elvira Fins
Center for Multilingual & Multicultural Studies
Primera Casa, 538
Florida International University
Miami, Florida 33199

Please call us at Suncom 441-3207 or 2851 if you have questions.
Our local numbers are 305-554-3207 or 305-554-2851

Foreign Language Instruction in Florida Project
October 15-16, 1986
Sheraton World
10100 International Drive
Orlando, Florida 32821
Phone: (305)362-1100
Coral Room B

AGENDA

Wednesday, October 15, 1986

1:00 P.M.-1:10 P.M.	Welcome and Introduction of Guests Update on Plans for November FLIF Meeting: Time and Place Update on FLIF Survey Review of FLIF Objectives	Ana Roca
1:10 P.M.-1:25 P.M.	General FLIF Project Update and Review of Status of Task Forces and Their Work	Rodolfo Cortina
1:25 P.M.-1:40 P.M.	Florida Legislation and the Need to Identify Competencies and Performance Standards: The Role of FLIF Project A New Task Force: Continuation of the Work of the Evaluation Teams	Paul Parker
1:40 P.M.-1:50 P.M.	Specific Tasks and Assignments for Today and Tomorrow Other business	Rodolfo Cortina
1:50 P.M.-2:00 P.M.	Questions and Answers	Management Team and Participants
2:00 P.M.-5:00 P.M.	WORKING MEETINGS OF TASK FORCES*	

*Please note: There will not be a formal coffe break. Each task force can decide when to take a short break. We would suggest a 5 to 10 minute break at 3:15 P.M.

Thursday, October 16, 1986
Coral Room B

8:30 A.M.-10:00 A.M.	Meetings of Task Forces Continue	
10:00 A.M.-10:30 A.M.	REPORTS FROM EACH TASK FORCE	
	1. Task Force on Instructional Technology	
	2. Task Force on Staff Development	
	3. Task Force on the Special Category Students	
	4. Task Force on Classical and Less-Commonly-Taught Languages	
	5. Task Force on Language Assesment	
	Special Report from Dave Ehlert on IBM-Sponsored Conference on Foreign Language Computer Technology: Possibilities and Resources	
10:30 A.M.-10:45	Questions and Answers	Management Team and Participants
10:45 A.M.-10:55 A.M.	Travel Authorization Forms, Reimbursement Forms, and other "Housekeeping" Tasks	Ana Roca and Participants
10:55 A.M.-12:30 P.M.	Check Out and Lunch	
12:30 P.M.-2:00 P.M.	MEETING OF NEW TASK FORCE on Competencies and Standards	
	MEETINGS OF OTHER TASK FORCES THAT NEED TO CONTINUE THEIR WORK	
2:00 P.M.	Adjourn	

Foreign Language Instruction in Florida
Sheraton River House
December 4-5, 1986
Final Meeting

Agenda

Thursday December 4, 1986

12:30 P.M. - 1:00 P.M. Deco Room	General Briefing: Survey Results Announcements
1:00 P.M.-5:00 P.M. Deco Room	Meeting of Task Forces
5:00 P.M.-5:30 P.M. Deco Room	Meeting of Steering Committee

Friday, December 5, 1986

8:30 A.M.-10:30 A.M. Deco Room	Reports of Task Force Recommendations
10:30 A.M.-12 Noon	Approval of Final Report Adjournment of General Meeting
1:00 P.M.	Management Team Meeting
3:00 P.M.	Adjournment of Management Team Meeting

Appendix: Definition of Proficiency Level Terminology

ACTFL PROFICIENCY GUIDELINES

The 1986 proficiency guidelines represent a hierarchy of global characterizations of integrated performance in speaking, listening, reading and writing. Each description is a representative, not an exhaustive, sample of a particular range of ability, and each level subsumes all previous levels, moving from simple to complex in an "all-before-and-more" fashion.

Because these guidelines identify stages of proficiency, as opposed to achievement, they are not intended to measure what an individual has achieved through specific classroom instruction but rather to allow assessment of what an individual can and cannot do, regardless of where, when, or how the language has been learned or acquired; thus, the words "learned" and "acquired" are used in the broadest sense. These guidelines are not based on a particular linguistic theory or pedagogical method, since the guidelines are proficiency-based, as opposed to achievement-based, and are intended to be used for global assessment.

The 1986 guidelines should not be considered the definitive version, since the construction and utilization of language proficiency guidelines is a dynamic, interactive process. The academic sector, like the government sector, will continue to refine and update the criteria periodically to reflect the needs of the users and the advances of the profession. In this vein, ACTFL owes a continuing debt to the creators of the 1982 provisional proficiency guidelines and, of course, to the members of the Interagency Language Roundtable Testing Committee, the creators of the government's Language Skill Level Descriptions.

ACTFL would like to thank the following individuals for their contributions on this current guidelines project:

Heidi Byrnes
James Child
Nina Levinson
Pardee Lowe, Jr.
Seiichi Makino
Irene Thompson
A. Ronald Walton

These proficiency guidelines are the product of grants from the U.S. Department of Education.

Generic Descriptions-Speaking

Novice	The Novice level is characterized by the ability to communicate minimally with learned material.
Novice-Low	Oral production consists of isolated words and perhaps a few high-frequency phrases. Essentially no functional communicative ability.
Novice-Mid	Oral production continues to consist of isolated words and learned phrases within very predictable areas of need, although quantity is increased. Vocabulary is sufficient only for handling simple, elementary needs and expressing basic courtesies. Utterances rarely consist of more than two or three words and show frequent long pauses and repetition of interlocutor's words. Speaker may have some difficulty producing even the simplest utterances. Some Novice-Mid speakers will be understood only with great difficulty.
Novice-High	Able to satisfy partially the requirements of basic communicative exchanges by relying heavily on learned utterances but occasionally expanding these through simple recombinations of their elements. Can ask questions or make statements involving learned material. Shows signs of spontaneity although this falls short of real autonomy of expression. Speech continues to consist of learned utterances rather than of personalized, situationally adapted ones. Vocabulary centers on areas such as basic objects, places, and most common kinship terms. Pronunciation may still be strongly influenced by first language. Errors are frequent and, in spite of repetition, some Novice-High speakers will have difficulty being understood even by sympathetic interlocutors.
Intermediate	The Intermediate level is characterized by the speaker's ability to: —create with the language by combining and recombining learned elements, though primarily in a reactive mode; —initiate, minimally sustain, and close in a simple way basic communicative tasks; and —ask and answer questions.
Intermediate-Low	Able to handle successfully a limited number of interactive, task-oriented and social situations. Can ask and answer questions, initiate and respond to simple statements and maintain face-to-face conversation, although in a highly restricted manner and with much linguistic inaccuracy. Within these limitations, can perform such tasks as introducing self, ordering a meal, asking directions, and making purchases. Vocabulary is adequate to express only the most elementary needs. Strong interference from native language may occur. Misunderstandings frequently arise, but with repetition, the Intermediate-Low speaker can generally be understood by sympathetic interlocutors.
Intermediate-Mid	Able to handle successfully a variety of uncomplicated, basic and communicative tasks and social situations. Can talk simply about self and family members. Can ask and answer questions and participate in simple conversations on topics beyond the most immediate needs; e.g., personal history and leisure time activities. Utterance length increases slightly, but speech may continue to be characterized by frequent long pauses, since the smooth incorporation of even basic conversational strategies is often hindered as the speaker struggles to create appropriate language forms. Pronunciation may continue to be strongly influenced by first language and fluency may still be strained. Although misunderstandings still arise, the Intermediate-Mid speaker can generally be understood by sympathetic interlocutors.
Intermediate-High	Able to handle successfully most uncomplicated communicative tasks and social situations. Can initiate, sustain, and close a general conversation with a number of strategies appropriate to a range of circumstances and topics, but errors are evident. Limited vocabulary still necessitates hesitation and may bring about slightly unexpected circumlocution. There is emerging evidence of connected discourse, particularly for simple narration and/or description. The Intermediate-High speaker can generally by understood even by interlocutors not accustomed to dealing with speakers at this level, but repetition may still be required.
Advanced	The Advanced level is characterized by the speaker's ability to: —converse in a clearly participatory fashion; —initiate, sustain, and bring to closure a wide variety of communicative tasks, including those that require an increased ability to convey meaning with diverse language strategies due to a complication or an unforeseen turn of events; —satisfy the requirements of school and work situations; and —narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse.

Advanced	Able to satisfy the requirements of everyday situations and routine school and work requirements. Can handle with confidence but not with facility complicated tasks and social situations, such as elaborating, complaining, and apologizing. Can narrate and describe with some details, linking sentences together smoothly. Can communicate facts and talk casually about topics of current public and personal interest, using general vocabulary. Shortcomings can often be smoothed over by communicative strategies, such as pause fillers, stalling devices, and different rates of speech. Circumlocution which arises from vocabulary or syntactic limitations very often is quite successful, though some groping for words may still be evident. The Advanced-level speaker can be understood without difficulty by native interlocutors.
Advanced-Plus	Able to satisfy the requirements of a broad variety of everyday, school, and work situations. Can discuss concrete topics relating to particular interests and special fields of competence. There is emerging evidence of ability to support opinions, explain in detail, and hypothesize. The Advanced-Plus speaker often shows a well developed ability to compensate for an imperfect grasp of some forms with confident use of communicative strategies, such as paraphrasing and circumlocution. Differentiated vocabulary and intonation are effectively used to communicate fine shades of meaning. The Advanced-Plus speaker often shows remarkable fluency and ease of speech but under the demands of Superior-level, complex tasks, language may break down or prove inadequate.
Superior	The Superior level is characterized by the speaker's ability to: —participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional, and abstract topics; and —support opinions and hypothesize using native-like discourse strategies.
Superior	Able to speak the language with sufficient accuracy to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional, and abstract topics. Can discuss special fields of competence and interest with ease. Can support opinions and hypothesize, but may not be able to tailor language to audience or discuss in depth highly abstract or unfamiliar topics. Usually the Superior level speaker is only partially familiar with regional or other dialectical variants. The Superior level speaker commands a wide variety of interactive strategies and shows good awareness of discourse strategies. The latter involves the ability to distinguish main ideas from supporting information through syntactic, lexical and suprasegmental features (pitch, stress, intonation). Sporadic errors may occur, particularly in low-frequency structures and some complex high-frequency structures more common to formal writing, but no patterns of error are evident. Errors do not disturb the native speaker or interfere with communication.

Generic Descriptions-Listening

These guidelines assume that all listening tasks take place in an authentic environment at a normal rate of speech using standard or near-standard norms.

Novice-Low	Understanding is limited to occasional isolated words, such as cognates, borrowed words, and high-frequency social conventions. Essentially no ability to comprehend even short utterances.
Novice-Mid	Able to understand some short, learned utterances, particularly where context strongly supports understanding and speech is clearly audible. Comprehends some words and phrases from simple questions, statements, high-frequency commands and courtesy formulae about topics that refer to basic personal information or the immediate physical setting. The listener requires long pauses for assimilation and periodically requests repetition and/or a slower rate of speech.
Novice-High	Able to understand short, learned utterances and some sentence-length utterances, particularly where context strongly supports understanding and speech is clearly audible. Comprehends words and phrases from simple questions, statements, high-frequency commands and courtesy formulae. May require repetition, rephrasing and/or a slowed rate of speech for comprehension.
Intermediate-Low	Able to understand sentence-length utterances which consist of recombinations of learned elements in a limited number of content areas, particularly if strongly supported by the situational context. Content refers to basic personal background and needs, social conventions and routine tasks, such as getting meals and receiving simple instructions and directions. Listening tasks pertain primarily to spontaneous face-to-face conversations. Understanding is often uneven; repetition and rewording may be necessary. Misunderstandings in both main ideas and details arise frequently.

Intermediate-Mid	Able to understand sentence-length utterances which consist of recombinations of learned utterances on a variety of topics. Content continues to refer primarily to basic personal background and needs, social conventions and somewhat more complex tasks, such as lodging, transportation, and shopping. Additional content areas include some personal interests and activities, and a greater diversity of instructions and directions. Listening tasks not only pertain to spontaneous face-to-face conversations but also to short routine telephone conversations and some deliberate speech, such as simple announcements and reports over the media. Understanding continues to be uneven.
Intermediate-High	Able to sustain understanding over longer stretches of connected discourse on a number of topics pertaining to different times and places; however, understanding is inconsistent due to failure to grasp main ideas and/or details. Thus, while topics do not differ significantly from those of an Advanced level listener, comprehension is less in quantity and poorer in quality.
Advanced	Able to understand main ideas and most details of connected discourse on a variety of topics beyond the immediacy of the situation. Comprehension may be uneven due to a variety of linguistic and extralinguistic factors, among which topic familiarity is very prominent. These texts frequently involve description and narration in different time frames or aspects, such as present, nonpast, habitual, or imperfective. Texts may include interviews, short lectures on familiar topics, and news items and reports primarily dealing with factual information. Listener is aware of cohesive devices but may not be able to use them to follow the sequence of thought in an oral text.
Advanced-Plus	Able to understand the main ideas of most speech in a standard dialect; however, the listener may not be able to sustain comprehension in extended discourse which is propositionally and linguistically complex. Listener shows an emerging awareness of culturally implied meanings beyond the surface meanings of the text but may fail to grasp sociocultural nuances of the message.
Superior	Able to understand the main ideas of all speech in a standard dialect, including technical discussion in a field of specialization. Can follow the essentials of extended discourse which is propositionally and linguistically complex, as in academic/professional settings, in lectures, speeches, and reports. Listener shows some appreciation of aesthetic norms of target language, of idioms, colloquialisms, and register shifting. Able to make inferences within the cultural framework of the target language. Understanding is aided by an awareness of the underlying organizational structure of the oral text and includes sensitivity for its social and cultural references and its affective overtones. Rarely misunderstands but may not understand excessively rapid, highly colloquial speech or speech that has strong cultural references.
Distinguished	Able to understand all forms and styles of speech pertinent to personal, social and professional needs tailored to different audiences. Shows strong sensitivity to social and cultural references and aesthetic norms by processing language from within the cultural framework. Texts include theater plays, screen productions, editorials, symposia, academic debates, public policy statements, literary readings, and most jokes and puns. May have difficulty with some dialects and slang.

Generic Descriptions-Reading

These guidelines assume all reading texts to be authentic and legible.

Novice-Low	Able occasionally to identify isolated words and/or major phrases when strongly supported by context.
Novice-Mid	Able to recognize the symbols of an alphabetic and/or syllabic writing system and/or a limited number of characters in a system that uses characters. The reader can identify an increasing number of highly contextualized words and/or phrases including cognates and borrowed words, where appropriate. Material understood rarely exceeds a single phrase at a time, and rereading may be required.
Novice-High	Has sufficient control of the writing system to interpret written language in areas of practical need. Where vocabulary has been learned, can read for instructional and directional purposes standardized messages, phrases or expressions, such as some items on menus, schedules, timetables, maps, and signs. At times, but not on a consistent basis, the Novice-High level reader may be able to derive meaning from material at a slightly higher level where context and/or extralinguistic background knowledge are supportive.

Intermediate-Low	Able to understand main ideas and/or some facts from the simplest connected texts dealing with basic personal and social needs. Such texts are linguistically noncomplex and have a clear underlying internal structure, for example chronological sequencing. They impart basic information about which the reader has to make only minimal suppositions or to which the reader brings personal interest and/or knowledge. Examples include messages with social purposes or information for the widest possible audience, such as public announcements and short, straightforward instructions dealing with public life. Some misunderstandings will occur.
Intermediate-Mid	Able to read consistently with increased understanding simple connected texts dealing with a variety of basic and social needs. Such texts are still linguistically noncomplex and have a clear underlying internal structure. They impart basic information about which the reader has to make minimal suppositions and to which the reader brings personal interest and/or knowledge. Examples may include short, straightforward descriptions of persons, places, and things written for a wide audience.
Intermediate—High	Able to read consistently with full understanding simple connected texts dealing with basic personal and social needs about which the reader has personal interest and/or knowledge. Can get some main ideas and information from texts at the next higher level featuring description and narration. Structural complexity may interfere with comprehension; for example, basic grammatical relations may be misinterpreted and temporal references may rely primarily on lexical items. Has some difficulty with the cohesive factors in discourse, such as matching pronouns with referents. While texts do not differ significantly from those at the Advanced level, comprehension is less consistent. May have to read material several times for understanding.
Advanced	Able to read somewhat longer prose of several paragraphs in length, particularly if presented with a clear underlying structure. The prose is predominantly in familar sentence patterns. Reader gets the main ideas and facts and misses some details. Comprehension derives not only from situational and subject matter knowledge but from increasing control of the language. Texts at this level include descriptions and narrations such as simple short stories, news items, bibliographical information, social notices, personal correspondence, routinized business letters and simple technical material written for the general reader.
Advanced-Plus	Able to follow essential points of written discourse at the Superior level in areas of special interest or knowledge. Able to understand parts of texts which are conceptually abstract and linguistically complex, and/or texts which treat unfamiliar topics and situations, as well as some texts which involve aspects of target-language culture. Able to comprehend the facts to make appropriate inferences. An emerging awareness of the aesthetic properties of language and of its literary styles permits comprehension of a wider variety of texts, including literary. Misunderstandings may occur.
Superior	Able to read with almost complete comprehension and at normal speed expository prose on unfamiliar subjects and a variety of literary texts. Reading ability is not dependent on subject matter knowledge, although the reader is not expected to comprehend thoroughly texts which are highly dependent on knowledge of the target culture. Reads easily for pleasure. Superior-level texts feature hypotheses, argumentation and supported opinions and include grammatical patterns and vocabulary ordinarily encountered in academic/professional reading. At this level, due to the control of general vocabulary and structure, the reader is almost always able to match the meanings derived from extralinguistic knowledge with meanings derived from knowledge of the language, allowing for smooth and efficient reading of diverse texts. Occasional misunderstandings may still occur; for example, the reader may experience some difficulty with unusually complex structures and low-frequency idioms. At the Superior level the reader can match strategies, top-down or bottom-up, which are most appropriate to the text. (Top-down strategies rely on real-world knowledge and prediction based on genre and organizational scheme of the text. Bottom-up strategies rely on actual linguistic knowledge.) Material at this level will include a variety of literary texts, editorials, correspondence, general reports and technical material in professional fields. Rereading is rarely necessary, and misreading is rare.
Distinguished	Able to read fluently and accurately most styles and forms of the language pertinent to academic and professional needs. Able to relate inferences in the text to real-world knowledge and understand almost all sociolinguistic and cultural references by processing language from within the cultural framework. Able to understand a writer's use of nuance and subtlety. Can readily follow unpredictable turns of thought and author intent in such materials as sophisticated editorials, specialized journal articles, and literary texts such as novels, plays, poems, as well as in any subject matter area directed to the general reader.

Generic Descriptions-Writing

Novice-Low	Able to form some letters in an alphabetic system. In languages whose writing systems use syllabaries or characters, writer is able to both copy and produce the basic strokes. Can produce romanization of isolated characters, where applicable.

Novice-Mid	Able to copy or transcribe familiar words or phrases and reproduce some from memory. No practical communicative writing skills.
Novice-High	Able to write simple fixed expressions and limited memorized material and some recombinations thereof. Can supply information on simple forms and documents. Can write names, numbers, dates, own nationality, and other simple autobiographical information as well as some short phrases and simple lists. Can write all the symbols in an alpahbetic or syllabic system or 50-100 characters or compounds in a character writing system. Spelling and representation of symbols (letters, syllables, characters) may be partially correct.
Intermediate-Low	Able to meet limited practical writing needs. Can write short messages, postcards, and take down simple notes, such as telephone messages. Can create statements or questions within the scope of limited language experience. Material produced consists of recombinations of learned vocabulary and structures into simple sentences on very familiar topics. Language is inadequate to express in writing anything but elementary needs. Frequent errors in grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling and in formation of nonalphabetic symbols, but writing can be understood by natives used to the writing of nonnatives.
Intermediate-Mid	Able to meet a number of practical writing needs. Can write short, simple letters. Content involves personal preferences, daily routine, everyday events, and other topics grounded in personal experience. Can express present time or at least one other time frame or aspect consistently, e.g., nonpast, habitual, imperfective. Evidence of control of the syntax of noncomplex sentences and basic inflectional morphology, such as declensions and conjugation. Writing tends to be a loose collection of sentences or sentence fragments on a given topic and provides little evidence of conscious organization. Can be understood by natives used to the writing of nonnatives.
Intermediate-High	Able to meet most practical writing needs and limited social demands. Can take notes in some detail on familiar topics and respond in writing to personal questions. Can write simple letters, brief synopses and paraphrases, summaries of biographical data, work and school experience. In those languages relying primarily on content words and time expressions to express time, tense, or aspect, some precision is displayed; where tense and/or aspect is expressed through verbal inflection, forms are produced rather consistently, but not always accurately. An ability to describe and narrate in paragraphs is emerging. Rarely uses basic cohesive elements, such as pronominal substitutions or synonyms in written discourse. Writing, though faulty, is generally comprehensible to natives used to the writing of nonnatives.
Advanced	Able to write routine social correspondence and join sentences in simple discourse of at least several paragraphs in length on familiar topics. Can write simple social correspondence, take notes, write cohesive summaries and resumes, as well as narratives and descriptions of a factual nature. Has sufficient writing vocabulary to express self simply with some circumlocution. May still make errors in punctuation, spelling, or the formation of nonalphabetic symbols. Good control of the morphology and the most frequently used syntactic structures, e.g., common word order patterns, coordination, subordination, but makes frequent errors in producing complex sentences. Uses a limited number of cohesive devices, such as pronouns, accurately. Writing may resemble literal translations from the native language, but a sense of organization (rhetorical structure) is emerging. Writing is understandable to natives not used to the writing of nonnatives.
Advanced-Plus	Able to write about a variety of topics with significant precision and in detail. Can write most social and informal business correspondence. Can describe and narrate personal experiences fully but has difficulty supporting points of view in written discourse. Can write about the concrete aspects of topics relating to particular interests and special fields of competence. Often shows remarkable fluency and ease of expression, but under time constraints and pressure writing may be inaccurate. Generally strong in either grammar or vocabulary, but not in both. Weakness and unevenness in one of the foregoing or in spelling or character writing formation may result in occasional miscommunication. Some misuse of vocabulary may still be evident. Style may still be obviously foreign.
Superior	Able to express self effectively in most formal and informal writing on practical, social and professional topics. Can write most types of correspondence, such as memos as well as social and business letters, and short research papers and statements of position in areas of special interest or in special fields. Good control of a full range of structures, spelling or nonalphabetic symbol production, and a wide general vocabulary allow the writer to hypothesize and present arguments or points of view accurately and effectively. An underlying organization, such as chronological ordering, logical ordering, cause and effect, comparison, and thematic development is strongly evident, although not thoroughly executed and/or not totally reflecting target language patterns. Although sensitive to differences in formal and informal style, still may not tailor writing precisely to a variety of purposes and/or readers. Errors in writing rarely disturb natives or cause miscommunication.

Appendix F

EXPECTED LEVELS OF ABSOLUTE SPEAKING PROFICIENCY IN LANGUAGES TAUGHT AT THE FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE

(Revised April 1973)

This chart was drawn up by the School of Language Studies of the Foreign Service Institute. It summarizes our experience with students as taught in our own classes rather than our judgments about the relative difficulty of these languages for speakers of English though there is undoubtedly some correlation. The expected speaking proficiency for a student with a given background and a given aptitude, in a given language, after a given number of weeks, will depend not only on the difficulty of the spoken language itself, but also on the amount of time and effort that the student has had to spend in concurrent study of the writing system.

GROUP I: Afrikaans, Danish, Dutch, French, Haitian Creole, Italian, Norwegian, Portuguese, Romanian, Spanish, Swahili, Swedish

	Aptitude for Language Learning		
*Length of Training**	*Minimum*	*Average*	*Superior*
8 weeks (240 hours)	1	1/1 +	1 +
16 weeks (480 hours)	1 +	2	2 +
24 weeks (720 hours)	2	2 +	3

GROUP II: Bulgarian, Dari, Farsi, German, Greek, Hindi, Indonesian, Malay, Urdu

	Aptitude for Language Learning		
Length of Training	*Minimum*	*Average*	*Superior*
16 weeks (480 hours)	1	1/1 +	1 + /2
24 weeks (720 hours)	1 +	2	2 + /3
44 weeks (1320 hours)	2/2 +	2 + /3	3/3 +

GROUP III: Amharic, Bengali, Burmese, Czech, Finnish, Hebrew, Hungarian, Khmer (Cambodian), Lao, Nepali, Pilipino, Polish, Russian, Serbo-Crotian, Sinhale, Thai, Tamil, Turkish, Vietnamese

	Aptitude for Language Learning		
Length of Training	*Minimum*	*Average*	*Superior*
16 weeks (480 hours)	0 +	1	1/1 +
24 weeks (720 hours)	1 +	2	2/2 +
44 weeks (1320 hours)	2	2 +	3

GROUP IV: Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Korean

	Aptitude for Language Learning		
Length of Training	*Minimum*	*Average*	*Superior*
16 weeks (480 hours)	0 +	1	1
24 weeks (720 hours)	1	1 +	1 +
44 weeks (1320 hours)	1 +	2	2 +
80-92 weeks (2400-2760 hours)	2 +	3	3 +

*The number of hours is the theoretical maximum at 30 hours a week.

Appendix G

CURRICULUM FRAMEWORK FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Gabriel M. Valdes
Florida Department of Education
Foreign Language Program Specialist

Introduction

In the State of Florida there is presently a renaissance in the study of foreign languages. Recent legislative actions have provided a positive impact on enrollment, curriculum and teachers. Foreign languages are elective credits for the high school graduation requirements; however, effective August 1987, applicants to our state universities must have earned two credits of a foreign language to be admitted. This entrance requirement has increased the enrollment of college-bound students in foreign language courses. Another program that has increased enrollment is the Florida Academic Scholars Program. It recognizes and rewards outstanding high school students who complete a rigorous and advanced program of prescribed studies, including two years of a foreign language. Finally, the Foreign Languages in Elementary School Program is starting to increase enrollment in the upper level courses because the students who have taken a foreign language in elementary schools arrive at secondary education at an advanced level.

This increase in enrollment has resulted in a shortage of foreign language teachers. To counteract this shortage of teachers, the Legislature established the Critical Teacher Shortage Program. This program has created a series of advantages for present and future teachers, such as grants for students preparing to become foreign language teachers, loan repayments for beginning teachers, and tuition reimbursement for teachers who want to take courses at the universities.

Curriculum Framework

The most important program created under the Critical Teacher Shortage is the Summer Institutes. These institutes provide rigorous content instruction in foreign languages to instructional personnel who have the assigned responsibility for teaching a foreign language. First priority for participation is given to those teaching a foreign language out-of-field. A foreign language teacher may participate in the rigorous content instruction of a language that he/she is not teaching.

Some other measures have been taken for counteracting this critical teacher shortage. An Alternative Certification Program has been created to provide certification to persons who hold a bachelor's degree in a foreign language. Adjunct instructors can be hired as part of the Visiting School Scholars Program. Retired teachers can be hired as substitute teachers and, finally, legislative action has called for the expansion of the Department of Education's career information system and the establishment of a teacher referral and recruitment center.

At the same time enrollment was increasing, the curriculum for foreign languages has become more consistent throughout the state. Chapter 83-350, Sections 95-104, Laws of Florida, has authorized the Department of Education to develop, maintain, and revise curriculum framework for the purpose of insuring a degree of instructional consistency within academic disciplines among high schools in Florida. Section 232.2454 (2) and (5), Florida Statutes, has required school districts to adopt student performance standards for each academic program in grades 9-12 for which credit toward high school graduation is awarded. These standards are based on the uniform curriculum frameworks adopted by the State Board of Education. The schools boards were also mandated by law to establish policies as to student mastery of performance standards before credit for the program can be awarded.

The Department of Education coordinated statewide developmental teams of local district personnel to write the curriculum frameworks for 9-12 basic education courses and adult courses. Approval by the State Board of Education of these curriculum frameworks was given on January 22, 1985. It is anticipated that the curriculum frameworks for grades 6, 7, and 8 will be completed and forwarded to the State Board of Education for approval during the Spring of 1986. The Department of Education also coordinated the task which involved district personnel throughout the State for the development of course performance standards for grades 9-12.

The purpose of this paper is to provide information about the curriculum frameworks and the student performance standards. Both will be defined in terms of the educational research on which they are based. The process for the development of curriculum frameworks and student performance standards will also be explained.

Description of Curriculum Frameworks and Student Performance Standards

The Legislature created principles for the development, maintenance, and review of curriculum frameworks. These principles provided definition and parameters for these frameworks. A curriculum framework was defined as a set of broad statewide guidelines which aid educational personnel in producing specific instructional plans for a given subject area or area of study to promote a degree of uniformity in curriculum offering throughout the State of Florida. The law mandated that the curriculum frameworks are to be based on current education research and literature, recognized educational concepts, and statutory and regulatory requirements. The frameworks for foreign language courses were developed based upon language acquisition and language learning theory and the proficiency scale developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) jointly with the American Council on the teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). Some other principles created by the Legislature addressed the process to be used to develop curriculum frameworks.

These are:

> Curriculum frameworks are to be developed with input from the professional knowledge and judgment of a broad spectrum of the educational community and other citizens.
>
> Curriculum frameworks are to be approved by the State Board of Education.
>
> Curriculum frameworks are to be reviewed, evaluated, and revised periodically to reflect statutory or regulatory changes and to make other adjustments necessary. Such revisions will be conducted by the Department of Education following a formal procedure which will involve a broad spectrum of educators and other citizens. Additions and deletions are to be approved by the State Board of Education in coordination with the annual update of the Course Code Directory.
>
> The Department of Education will exercise ongoing coordination and oversight of the development and implementation of curriculum frameworks.
>
> The ongoing coordination and oversight will be exercised, in part, through the Department of Education's existing program compliance and performance audits, review of district implementation of curriculum frameworks, and through the annual updating and approval by the State Board of Education of the Course Code Directory.

Each framework contains a header and four sections: major concepts/content, laboratory activities, special notes, and intended outcomes. Included in the curriculum framework header are descriptive elements including the major subject area of which the course is a part, the seven-digit course number and full course title, the amount of credit generated by the course, and applicable grade levels and recommended certification. Also, the header indicates whether courses meet requirements for graduation or the Florida Academic Scholars Certificate program.

Section I, "Major Concepts/Content," provides a concise summary of the course. Section II describes integral laboratory activities. In foreign languages, no laboratory activity is described because the language laboratory is considered supplemental instead of integral. Special notes about an individual course provide information specific and unique to that course. In foreign languages this section is not used. Intended outcomes are broad statements reflecting essential elements which students should demonstrate after successfully completing the course. In foreign languages, intended outcomes are defined as broad statements of what the students may perform outside the classroom in a real life setting and which cannot be measured using regular forms of assessment.

The frameworks have omitted prerequisites to allow districts maximum flexibility in establishing course sequence. Districts may establish desired prerequisites and may offer courses for high schools and adult education in any desired order. In foreign languages the sequential number that is part of the course title establishes the sequential order necessary to acquire proficiency skills. Topics and areas of study listed in each framework are vital components of the course. Districts are encouraged to expand courses as desired to meet local needs. The curriculum frameworks do not dictate techniques or methodology. Instructional materials may be determined by local school districts. For a sample of a curriculum framework, please see Appendix A.

The Legislature also created principles for the development, maintenance, and review of student performance standards. Each district school board was directed through legislation to develop specific student performance standards for each course in grades 9-12 and assessment procedures for determining student mastery of these standards. However, to provide school districts with a sample of standards, the Department of Education coordinated the task which involved district personnel throughout the State for the development of course performance standards for grades 9-12.

Student performance standards are defined to be broad statements specifying competencies needed to perform selected tasks. In foreign languages, student performance standards are defined as specific statements of what the students may perform in a classroom and which can be measured using regular forms of assessment. These standards are directly related to the intended outcomes in the curriculum frameworks. By legislative mandate these standards are to be developed with input from a broad spectrum of the educational community and other citizens. For a sample of student performance standards, please see Appendix B.

Process for the Development of Curriculum Frameworks and Student Performance Standards

On the basis of the 1983 legislation and the need for an underlying structure to enable school districts to design and develop consistent instructional programs, the Bureau of Curriculum Services in the Division of Public Schools of the Department of Education organized and developed strategies for securing input vital to the development of curriculum frameworks and student performance standards for basic courses in high school and adult education programs. Through an established process, local school districts and other members of the educational community, in a joint venture with the Department of Education, developed curriculum frameworks and student performance standards in nineteen basic areas, including foreign languages.

The development and approval of curriculum frameworks took nearly two years. The task for the development of student performance standards took a year to complete. A chronology of events will provide insight into the final products. In July 1983, Chapter 83-350, Laws of Florida, authorized the Department of Education to develop, maintain, and revise curriculum frameworks for the purpose of insuring a degree of instructional consistency within academic disciplines among high schools in Florida. Responsibility for development of curriculum frameworks was assigned to the Bureau of Curriculum Services in August of that year. Bureau contact persons for each academic area were identified. During September and October, 1983, four regional meetings were held to organize subject area committees for developing model curriculum frameworks and student performance standards for all academic areas. Regional committees met at various times and locations during October and November to write drafts of curriculum frameworks.

The four regional committees for foreign languages were formed by district foreign language supervisors and teachers. A generalist and the foreign language program specialist from the Bureau of Curriculum Services were assigned the task of working with all the committees to provide consistency to the final product. The committees established a close relationship among themselves and with foreign language supervisors and teachers throughout the state that were not working directly in any of the committees. The first task was to state subject area goals and objectives. The four committees agreed on the following goals and objectives for the foreign language program:

Curriculum Framework

The general goals of the foreign language program are to promote the educational benefits to be acquired through the study of foreign languages and to provide instruction toward the acquisition and learning of the target language and its culture.

For objectives, the foreign language program will strive to provide the students with:

1. Skills in listening and speaking in the foreign language, commensurate with the student's level of experience in the language.
2. Skills in reading and writing in the foreign language, commensurate with the student's level of experience in the language.
3. An appreciation and understanding of the historical and cultural values of the people who speak the target language, including comparing and contrasting of the foreign culture with that of the United States.
4. A better understanding and control of the student's own language by comparing selective phonological, morphological, syntactical, and lexical patterns with those in the foreign language.
5. An awareness of the value of foreign languages as employable communication skills needed in professional and vocational areas.
6. A foundation for continuing the study of foreign languages beyond the high school experience.

The committees considered that the skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing should be grouped into oral communication and written communication in Objectives 1 and 2. Culture deserved an objective by itself. The assistance that a foreign language provides for a better understanding of English was also considered an objective by itself, as well as the basis for careers and professions that foreign languages provide. Finally, foreign languages in high schools were considered a foundation for futher study not only at the university level but as a life-long study in any place where foreign languages skills could be acquired.

These goals and objectives, as well as enrollment statistics, were used to establish course offerings. The committees decided to develop curriculum frameworks for French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Italian, Latin, Russian, and Spanish. It was also decided that, with the exception of Latin and Spanish for Spanish-speakers, the curriculum frameworks should be generic for all languages. This would provide for the insertion in the process of any new languages that a district might wish to teach. After having established the goals and objectives and the course offerings, the committees worked on the rest of the sections of the curriculum frameworks. Samples of curriculum guides from foreign language programs in schools districts in Florida and throughout the nation were gathered to serve as a basis for the task of the committees.

The Program Assistance Section of the Bureau of Curriculum Services was assigned responsibility for finalizing the format which would be used for typing curriculum frameworks and student performance standards. Drafts of curriculum frameworks were received by the Department of Education, typed in the common format and sent to school districts for review by December 1983. Review sessions were held at the January, 1984, Division of Public Schools Conference in Orlando and school districts suggested revisions to the curriculum frameworks. From February to April 1984, Bureau of Curriculum Services program area specialists revised curriculum frameworks based upon district input. The curriculum frameworks were retyped in draft form and printed for distribution. In March 1984, regional writing teams began developing student performance standards based on the draft of the curriculum frameworks. On April 17, 1984, curriculum frameworks were mailed to districts for final review. All district input regarding curriculum frameworks was due and received by May 23, 1984. Five simultaneous regional meetings were held on May 31 to receive final input. From June through September, DOE program area specialists prepared final draft curriculum frameworks based upon district and regional meeting input. Frameworks were typed in final draft form. Curriculum frameworks were approved by the Division of Public Schools Rules Committee in October and by the Department of Education Rules Committee in November. The State Board of Education approved the curriculum frameworks in January 1985. After the State Board approval, the official curriculum frameworks were distributed statewide.

As stated above, Section 232.2454 (2) and (5), Florida Statutes, authorized school districts to adopt, by July 1, 1985, student performance standards for each academic program in grades 9-12 for which credit toward high school graduation is awarded. These standards were to be based on the uniform curriculum frameworks adopted by the State Board of Education. As we have seen, curriculum frameworks were in the process of development during a period that went from July 1983 to March 1984. In order to assist districts in the development of student performance standards, the same regional writing committees that wrote the curriculum frameworks began developing student performance standards for each curriculum framework in March 1984. The samples developed by the committees were gathered and a student performance standard workshop was held in Tampa on September 17-19, 1984, for the purpose of reviewing regional writing teams efforts and combining these into one document. From December 1984 to January 1985, the final product was typed in draft form and distributed to districts for final review. Five simultaneous regional meetings were held on February 19, 1985, to receive final input regarding student performance standards. During February and March, a summary of suggested revisions was prepared by Bureau of Curriculum Services staff, typed and printed for distribution. In March 1985, student performance standards and suggested revisions were distributed statewide. School districts adopted or adapted this document or used it as a guide for developing district student performance standards for inclusion in pupil progression plans by July 1, 1985, as required by law.

Conclusion

This paper has presented information about curriculum frameworks and student performance standards, authorized by law in the State of Florida for the purpose of insuring a degree of instructional consistency within academic disciplines, including foreign languages among high schools in Florida. Both curriculum frameworks and student performance standards were defined in terms of the educational research on which they were based. The process for the development of frameworks and standards was explained using a chronology of events.

Two issues have to be considered regarding perspectives for the future of foreign language education in the State of Florida: (1) the acceptance by school districts and foreign language teachers of the documents developed, and (2) the implementation of a program based on curriculum frameworks and student performance standards. The first issue can be resolved by looking at the process established for the development of the frameworks and standards. The second issue will have to wait until the program is implemented in school year 1985-86.

The process used for the development of curriculum frameworks and student performance standards ensured that every school district and, at least theoretically, every teacher had the opportunity to provide input into the development. The adoption by almost all school districts of the student performance standards developed by the regional committees proves that both the curriculum frameworks and the student performance standards have been accepted statewide. The annual revision of frameworks and standards will allow the changes needed for the implementation of foreign language programs throughout the State of Florida.

The implementation of a foreign language program based on the approved curriculum framework and student performance standards implies a shift away from the traditional curriculum in foreign languages. Both intended outcomes and performance standards state what the student will be able to do with the language and the level of proficiency used by the student to communicate in oral and written forms. Oral communication with a certain level of proficiency implies the use of oral assessment in which the student will have to produce the language, and the teacher will have to assess this production. Not all the foreign language teachers have been trained to conduct this oral production assessment. This is only an example of the changes in curriculum that are requested by the implementation of curriculum frameworks. It is expected that inservice training for foreign language teachers will assist in the implementation of the foreign language programs in the State of Florida.

Appendix H

SAMPLE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CURRICULUM FRAMEWORK AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

First two years of secondary instruction

CURRICULUM FRAMEWORK
Florida Department of Education

SUBJECT AREA: FOREIGN LANGUAGES

COURSE NUMBER: 0701320 COURSE TITLE: FRENCH I

CREDIT: ___ .5 _X_ 1.0

APPLICABLE GRADE LEVEL(S): _ P/K-5 _ 6-8 _X_ 9-12 _X_ ADULT
_ EXCEPTIONAL _ VOCATIONAL

WILL MEET FLORIDA ACADEMIC
SCHOLARS PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGES

RECOMMENDED CERTIFICATION: FRENCH 2 4

I. MAJOR CONCEPTS/CONTENT: THE PURPOSE OF THIS COURSE IS TO INTRODUCE STUDENTS TO THE TARGET LANGUAGE AND ITS CULTURE AND TO DEVELOP COMMUNICATIVE SKILLS AND CROSS-CULTURAL UNDERSTANDING.

THE CONTENT SHOULD INCLUDE, BUT NOT BE LIMITED TO, BEGINNING SKILLS IN LISTENING AND SPEAKING WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION TO PRONUNCIATION. AN INTRODUCTION TO READING AND WRITING SHOULD ALSO BE INCLUDED, AS WELL AS THE FUNDAMENTALS OF GRAMMAR AND CULTURE.

II. LABORATORY ACTIVITIES: NONE

III. SPECIAL NOTE: NONE

IV. INTENDED OUTCOMES: AFTER SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETING THIS COURSE, THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO

1. POSSESS SUFFICIENT BASIC VOCABULARY AND STRUCTURE TO COMPREHEND OTHERS AND EXPRESS ONESELF IN AREAS OF IMMEDIATE NEED, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, GREETINGS, SOCIAL PLEASANTRIES, CLASSROOM OBJECTS AND ACTIVITIES, PERSONAL DATA, FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS, DAILY ACTIVITIES AND INTERESTS, WEATHER AND TIME EXPRESSIONS, TRANSPORTATION AND TRAVEL, ORDERING IN A RESTAURANT, AND SHOPPING.
2. RESPOND WITHOUT REFERENCE TO ENGLISH WITHIN THE LIMITS OF VOCABULARY AND STRUCTURES OF THE COURSE.
3. RECOGNIZE THE LETTERS OF THE ALPHABET AS WELL AS THE TYPICAL WORD ORDER PATTERNS OF SENTENCES.
4. COMPREHEND READING MATERIAL THAT HAS BEEN PRESENTED IN CLASS INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, ITEMS ON MENUS, SCHEDULES AND TIME TABLES, AND MAPS AND SIGNS.
5. WRITE SIMPLE SENTENCES IN THE PRESENT TENSE.
6. WRITE PERSONAL DATA AND SIMPLE BIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION.
7. BE AWARE OF BASIC ASPECTS OF THE FRENCH CULTURE INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, HOLIDAYS, CUSTOMS, COMMON FOODS, LEISURE ACTIVITIES, AND SELECTED ARTISTIC FORMS (MUSIC, DANCE, GRAPHIC ARTS).
8. COMPARE AND CONTRAST ASPECTS OF THE CULTURE OF FRENCH-SPEAKING PEOPLE WITH THE CULTURE IN THE UNITED STATES, INCLUDING COMMON NON-VERBAL RESPONSES.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Subject Area FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Course Number 0701320 Course Title French I

COURSE STUDENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

After successfully completing this course, the student will

1. Possess sufficient basic vocabulary and structure to comprehend others and express him/herself in areas of immediate need including, but not limited to, greetings, social pleasantries, classroom objects and activities, personal data, family relationships, daily activities and interests, weather and time expressions, transportation and travel, ordering in a restaurant, and shopping.

   The student will
   1.01 demonstrate knowledge and application of specific vocabulary in areas of everyday life, such as:
   - greetings and social pleasantries
   - classroom objects and activities
   - personal data
   - family relationships
   - daily activities and interests
   - weather expressions and seasons
   - time/date expressions
   - transportation and travel
   - ordering in a restaurant and shopping
   - colors
   - numbers

2. Respond, without reference to English, within the limits of vocabulary and structures of the course.

   The student will
   2.01 respond to oral directions and classroom commands.
   2.02 choose correct responses to oral questions to exhibit comprehension of conversations and narratives.
   2.03 respond to a statement or question requiring no change in structure.
   2.04 respond to a question requiring structural change.

3. Recognize the letters of the alphabet as well as the typical word order patterns of sentences.

   The student will
   3.01 recognize the letters of the alphabet.
   3.02 recognize and respond to interrogative and declarative statements in the affirmative, as well as the negative, in present tense.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Subject Area FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Course Number 0701320 Course Title French I

COURSE STUDENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

4. Comprehend reading material that has been presented in class including, but not limited to, items on memus, schedules and time tables, and maps and signs.

The student will
4.01 demonstrate reading comprehension of passages containing familiar vocabulary and structures.

5. Write simple sentences in the present tense.

The student will
5.01 write declarative and interrogative sentences, in the affirmative and negative forms, in the present tense using correct word order.

6. Write personal data and simple biographic information.

The student will
6.01 write personal data including age, dates, nationality, address and other biographical information.

7. Be aware of basic aspects of the French culture including, but not limited to, holidays, customs, common foods, leisure-time activities, and selected artistic forms (music, dance, and graphic arts).

The student will
7.01 identify various regions of the world where French is spoken.
7.02 identify some major holidays, festivals, customs, and historical events of the French-speaking people.
7.03 identify some typical foods, leisure-time activities, and selected artistic forms of the French-speaking world.

8. Compare and contrast aspects of the culture of the French-speaking people with the culture in the United States, including common non-verbal responses.

The student will
8.01 give examples of the influence of the French culture on the development of North America.
8.02 list influences of the language on English.
8.03 demonstrate understanding of lifestyles of the people who speak French.
8.04 demonstrate awareness of common non-verbal responses in the French culture.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CURRICULUM FRAMEWORK
Florida Department of Education

SUBJECT AREA: FOREIGN LANGUAGES

COURSE NUMBER: 0701330 COURSE TITLE: FRENCH II

CREDIT: ____ .5 _X_ 1.0

APPLICABLE GRADE LEVEL(S): __ P/K-5 __ 6-8 X 9-12 X ADULT
__ EXCEPTIONAL __ VOCATIONAL

WILL MEET FLORIDA ACADEMIC
SCHOLARS PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGES

RECOMMENDED CERTIFICATION: FRENCH 2 4

I. MAJOR CONCEPTS/CONTENT: THE PURPOSE OF THIS COURSE IS TO REINFORCE THE FUNDAMENTAL SKILLS PREVIOUSLY ACQUIRED BY THE STUDENTS. THIS COURSE DEVELOPS INCREASED LISTENING, SPEAKING, READING, AND WRITING SKILLS AS WELL AS CULTURAL AWARENESS.

THE CONTENT SHOULD INCLUDE, BUT NOT BE LIMITED TO, AN EXPANSION OF THE LISTENING AND ORAL SKILLS PREVIOUSLY ACQUIRED. READING AND WRITING SHOULD RECEIVE MORE EMPHASIS, WHILE ORAL COMMUNICATION REMAINS THE PRIMARY OBJECTIVE. THIS COURSE SHOULD INCLUDE A CULTURAL SURVEY OF FRENCH-SPEAKING PEOPLE.

II. LABORATORY ACTIVITIES: NONE

III. SPECIAL NOTE: NONE

IV. INTENDED OUTCOMES: AFTER SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETING THIS COURSE, THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO

1. ANSWER AND ASK QUESTIONS AND MAKE STATEMENTS ABOUT PRESENT AND PAST SITUATIONS IN ORDER TO SATISFY PERSONAL NEEDS.
2. UNDERSTAND SPOKEN FRENCH RELATING TO FAMILIAR SITUATIONS WHEN SPOKEN AT A MODERATE TEMPO WITH STANDARD INTONATION.
3. READ SELECTED PASSAGES WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF ONE'S ACQUIRED VOCABULARY AND GRAMMAR.
4. DEMONSTRATE SUFFICIENT READING COMPREHENSION TO UNDERSTAND PRINTED INFORMATION, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, ANNOUNCEMENTS OF PUBLIC EVENTS, POPULAR ADVERTISING, SIMPLE NARRATION OF EVENTS, NEWSPAPER HEADLINES, AND STORY TITLES.
5. WRITE BASIC SENTENCES AND ANSWER PERSONAL QUESTIONS WITHIN THE ACQUIRED VOCABULARY AND GRAMMAR.
6. WRITE SHORT COMPOSITIONS IN FRENCH
7. DEMONSTRATE LIMITED SOCIAL COMPETENCE IN THE FOREIGN CULTURE, BY SHOWING COMPREHENSION OF COMMON RULES OF ETIQUETTE, CUSTOMS, AND SENSITIVITIES, AND A KNOWLEDGE OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES BY FRENCH-SPEAKING PEOPLE.
8. POSSESS A KNOWLEDGE OF ASPECTS OF THE CULTURE OF FRENCH-SPEAKING PEOPLE PERTAINING TO HISTORICAL HIGHLIGHTS, LEISURE-TIME ACTIVITIES, FESTIVALS, AND TRADITIONS.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Subject Area FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Course Number 0701330 Course Title French II

COURSE STUDENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

After successfully completing this course, the student will

1. Answer and ask questions and make statements in present and past tenses in order to satisfy personal needs.

   The student will
   1.01 answer questions about himself/herself.
   1.02 ask for and give directions.
   1.03 describe objects, people, actions and personal activities.

2. Understand spoken French relating to familiar situations when spoken at a moderate tempo with standard intonation.

   The student will
   2.01 respond to oral directions and classroom commands.
   2.02 answer questions based on a conversation or other oral narrative.

3. Read selected passages within the context of his/her acquired vocabulary and grammar.

   The student will
   3.01 answer questions pertaining to reading selections.
   3.02 read aloud familiar material evidencing acceptable pronunciation, intonation, stress and expression.

4. Demonstrate sufficient reading comprehension to understand printed information including, but not limited to, announcements of public events, popular advertising, simple narration of events, newspaper headlines, and story titles.

   The student will
   4.01 evidence comprehension after reading passages with a few unfamiliar words whose meanings should be ascertained through context.

5. Write basic sentences and answer personal questions within the acquired vocabulary and grammar.

   The student will
   5.01 answer questions in complete sentences about biographical data.
   5.02 write complete sentences using acquired vocabulary.

6. Write short compositions in French.

   The student will
   6.01 write a guided paragraph or dialogue.
   6.02 write a note of thanks, an invitation, or a phone message.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Subject Area FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Course Number 0701330 Course Title French II

COURSE STUDENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

7. Demonstrate limited social competence in the foreign culture, by showing comprehension of common rules of etiquette, customs, and sensitivities, and a knowledge of contributions to the arts and humanities by French-speaking people.

   The student will
   7.01 identify selected contributions to the arts and humanities by the target culture.
   7.02 demonstrate limited social competence in a French-speaking environment.

8. Possess a knowledge of aspects of the culture of French-speaking people pertaining to historical highlights, leisure-time activities, festivals, and traditions.

   The student will
   8.01 identify selected historical and cultural highlights of countries where the French language is spoken.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FRAMEWORKS: COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Appendix I

Subject Area: Foreign Languages
Course Number: 1100
Contact Hours: 3
Credit Hours: 3

I. MAJOR CONCEPTS/CONTENT:

The purposes of this course are to introduce students to the four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) of the target language, to encourage students to appreciate the cultural contributions of the countries where the language is spoken.

II. LABORATORY ACTIVITIES:

Required (minimum of 1 hr. per week recommended)

III. SPECIAL NOTE:

None

IV. INTENDED OUTCOMES:

After successfully completing this course, the student will be able to demonstrate the following skills:

1. Listening: Be able to understand selected words, phrases, common idioms, and sentences related to classroom and everyday situations such as social pleasantries, class activities, personal and family data, daily activities and interests.
2. Speaking: Be able to respond appropriately in the target language to questions related to social pleasantries, class activities, personal and family data, daily activities and interests. Pronunciation will be in a manner comprehensible to a native speaker.
3. Reading: Be able to read and comprehend previously learned material.
4. Writing: Be able to write basic sentences and paragraphs in the target language, utilizing the acquired vocabulary and grammar.
5. Grammar: Be able to use verbs in the present and past tenses, be aware of sentence patterns in statements (affirmative and negative) and questions, and be familiar with the pronouns.
6. Culture: Be aware of basic aspects of the culture, including, but not limited to, holidays, customs, common foods, leisure activities, and selected artistic forms.

COURSE STUDENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Subject Area: Foreign Languages
Course Number: 1100

After successfully completing this course, the students will

1. Listening: Be able to comprehend selected words, phrases, common idioms, and sentences related to classroom and everyday situations such as social pleasantries, class activities, personal and family data, daily activities and interests.

   The students will

   1.01 Comprehend phrases, statements, and questions addressed to them in situations related to:
      a. greetings and social pleasantries
      b. classroom objects and activities
      c. personal and family data
      d. daily activities and interests

2. Speaking: Be able to respond appropriately in the target language to questions related to social pleasantries, class activities, personal and family data, daily activities and interests. Pronunciation will be in a manner comprehensible to a native speaker.

   The students will

   2.01 respond to oral classroom directions given in the target language.
   2.02 respond in the target language to questions addressed to them.
   2.03 choose correct responses to oral questions.
   2.04 respond to oral questions requiring structural changes.
   2.05 speak in a manner comprehensible to a native speaker.

3. Reading: Be able to read and comprehend previously learned material.

   The students will

   3.01 read orally with some assistance in pronunciation.
   3.02 give the correct response to oral and written questions.

4. Writing: Be able to write basic sentences and paragraphs in the target language, utilizing the acquired vocabulary and grammar.

   The students will
   4.01 write controlled and original sentences in the target language.
   4.02 write controlled and independent paragraphs in the target language.

Performance Standards (continued)

5. Grammar: Be able to use verbs in the present and past tenses, be aware of sentence patterns in statements (affirmative and negative) and questions, and be familiar with the pronouns of the target language.

   The students will

   5.01 use verbs in the present and past tenses with reasonable accuracy.
   5.02 recognize and respond to declarative and interrogative, affirmative and negative sentences in the present and past tenses.
   5.03 use with reasonable accuracy the pronouns of the target language.

6. Culture: Be aware of basic aspects of the culture, including, but not limited to holidays, customs, common foods, leisure activities, and selected artistic forms.

   The students will

   6.01 identify some major holidays, festivals, customs, typical foods, leisure-time activities, selected artistic forms, and major historical events of the target countries.
   6.02 demonstrate awareness of life-styles of people who speak the target language.
   6.03 gain an appreciation of the similarities and differences of life-styles in target countries and those of the United States.

Subject Area: Foreign Languages
Course Number: 1101
Contact Hours: 3
Credit Hours: 3

I. MAJOR CONCEPTS/CONTENT:

The purpose of this course is to reinforce the basic skills previously acquired by students. This course develops increased listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills as well as grammar knowledge and cultural awareness.

II. LABORATORY ACTIVITIES:

Required (minimum of 1 hour per week recommended)

III. SPECIAL NOTE:

None

IV: INTENDED OUTCOMES:

After successfully completing this course, the students will be able to demonstrate the following skills:

1. Listening: Be able to understand spoken language in context.

2. Speaking: Be able to respond with greater accuracy to questions related to familiar and new situations and to initiate simple conversations. Pronunciation will be in a manner comprehensible to a native speaker.

3. Reading: Be able to read and comprehend previously learned material with greater accuracy.

4. Writing: Be able to write basic sentences and paragraphs in the target language, utilizing, with greater accuracy, the acquired vocabulary and grammar.

5. Grammar: Be able to use verbs in simple and compound tenses to expand use of selected grammatical structures.

6. Culture: Demonstrate limited social competence in the foreign culture by showing comprehension of common rules of etiquette, customs and sensitivities, and a knowledge of contributions to the arts and humanities by the people who speak the target language.

COURSE STUDENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Subject Area: Foreign Languages
Course Number: 1101

After successfully completing this course, the students will

1. Listening: Be able to understand the spoken language in context.

   The students will

   1.01 understand commands and directions.
   1.02 understand the spoken language related to learned situations.

2. Speaking: Be able to respond with greater accuracy to questions related to familiar and new situations and to initiate simple conversations. Pronunciation will be in a manner comprehensible to a native speaker.

   The students will

   2.01 respond appropriately to questions about themselves and about familiar and new situations.
   2.02 formulate questions in the target language.

3. Reading: Be able to read and comprehend with greater accuracy.

   The students will

   3.01 read orally with greater facility.
   3.02 answer with greater accuracy written questions on material not previously learned but within the vocabulary and grammar taught in the course.

4. Writing: Be able to write basic sentences and paragraphs in the target language, utilizing the acquired vocabulary and grammar.

   The students will

   4.01 write sentences based on previously learned material
   4.02 write, following clear guidelines, short compositions based on relevant data with greater accuracy.

Performance Standards (continued)

5. Grammar: Be able to use verbs in simple and compound tenses, and to expand use of selected grammatical structures.

   The students will

   5.01 use correctly verbs in simple and compound tenses.
   5.02 recognize and respond to declarative and interrogative, affirmative and negative sentences in the simple and compound tenses.
   5.03 use with greater accuracy the pronouns.
   5.04 use selected grammatical structures.

6. Culture: Demonstrate limited social competence in the foreign culture by showing comprehension of common rules of etiquette, customs and sensitivities, and a knowledge of contributions to the arts and humanities by the people who speak the target language.

   The students will

   6.01 identify major historical events.
   6.02 be aware of certain aspects of the culture of the target country such as family customs, education, holidays, and leisure-time activities.
   6.03 identify important contributions of the people who speak the target language.
   6.04 gain an awareness of the similarities and differences of life-styles of the target country and those of the United States.

Subject Area: Foreign Languages
Course Number: 2200
Contact Hours: 3
Credit Hours: 3

I. MAJOR CONCEPTS/CONTENT:

The purpose of this course is to expand and review the skills previously acquired by the students.

The content should include, but not be limited to, more advanced language structures and idiomatic expressions, with emphasis on conversational skills. There should be additional growth in vocabulary for practical purposes, including writing. Reading selections should be varied.

II. LABORATORY ACTIVITIES:

Required (minimum of 1 hour per week recommended). Review of grammar points and social behavior in the laboratory and/our with other multi-media reinforcements.

III. SPECIAL NOTE:

None

IV. INTENDED OUTCOMES:

After successfully completing this course, the students will be able to demonstrate the following skills:

1. Listening: Be able to understand the spoken target language used in both learned and new material.
2. Speaking: Be able to respond to material within the limits of the course prescription and to initiate some speaking situations.
3. Reading: Be able to read and comprehend selected material on a wide range of topics.
4. Writing: Be able to write compositions based on assigned material, using proper syntax and grammar.
5. Grammar: Be able to apply grammatical principles previously acquired and to increase their knowledge of more advanced grammar.
6. Culture: Be able to possess knowledge and appreciation of the cultural contributions of the speakers of the target language.

COURSE STUDENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Subject Area: Foreign Languages
Course Number: 2200

After successfully completing this course, the students will

1. Listening: Be able to understand the spoken targetlanguage used in both learned and new material.

   The students will

   1.01 understand classroom commands and directions given in the target language.
   1.02 understand oral narratives based on learned material, responding to various types of questions.
   1.03 comprehend native speakers (with greater accuracy).

2. Speaking: Be able to respond to material within the limits of the course prescription and to initiate some speaking situations.

   The students will

   2.01 respond appropriately to questions, utilizing grammatical principles.
   2.02 initiate conversations.
   2.03 respond correctly to realistic situations.

3. Reading: Be able to read and comprehend selected material on a wide range of topics.

   The students will

   3.01 read and comprehend selected readings.
   3.02 respond in a manner which demonstrates comprehension of selected readings.

4. Writing: Be able to write compositions based on assigned material, using proper syntax and grammar.

   The students will

   4.01 write acceptable responses based on material read.
   4.02 write compositions employing previously acquired knowledge.

Performance Standards (continued)

5. Grammar: Be able to apply grammatical principles previously acquired an to increase their knowledge of more advanced grammar.

   The students will

   5.01 apply previously acquired grammar.
   5.02 use previously and new verb tenses correctly.
   5.03 utilize more advanced grammar.

6. Culture: Be able to possess knowledge and appreciation of the speakers of the target language.

   The students will

   6.01 demonstrate a recognition of the attitudes of the culture of the speakers of the target language.
   6.02 illustrate tolerance and acceptance of the culture.

Subject Area: Foreign Languages
Course Number: 2201
Contact Hours: 3
Credit Hours: 3

I. MAJOR CONCEPTS/CONTENT:

The purpose of this course is to expand and review the skills previously acquired by the students.

The content should include, but not be limited to, more advanced conversation language structures and idiomatic expressions, with emphasis on conversational skills. There should be additional growth in vocabulary for practical purposes, including writing. Reading selections should be varied.

II. LABORATORY ACTIVITIES:

Required (minimum of 1 hour per week recommended). Emphasis will be on listening and speaking skills through use of the laboratory and multi-media facilities.

III. SPECIAL NOTE:

None

IV. INTENDED OUTCOMES:

After successfully completing this course, the students will be able to demonstrate the following skills:

1. Listening: Be able to understand the spoken target language used in both learned and new material.
2. Speaking: Be able to respond to material within the limits of the course prescription and to initiate some speaking situations.
3. Reading: Be able to read and comprehend selected material on a wide range of topics.
4. Writing: Be able to write compositions based on assigned material, using proper syntax and grammar.
5. Grammar: Be able to apply their knowledge of more advance grammar especially through conversation and writing.
6. Culture: Be able to possess knowledge and appreciation of the cultural contributions of the speakers of the target language.

COURSE STUDENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Subject Area: Foreign Languages
Course Number: 2201

After successfully completing this course, the students will

1. Listening: Be able to understand the spoken target language used in both learned and new material.

   The students will

   1.01 understand oral narratives based on learned material, responding to various types of questions.
   1.02 comprehend native speakers (with greater accuracy).

2. Speaking: Be able to respond to material within the limits of the course prescription and to initiate speaking situations.

   The students will

   2.01 respond correctly to questions.
   2.02 initiate and participate in conversations and discussions.
   2.03 respond correctly to realistic situations.
   2.04 deliver in an acceptable manner prepared and impromptu speeches.

3. Reading: Be able to read and comprehend selected material on a wide range of topics.

   The students will

   3.01 read and comprehend selected readings.
   3.02 respond in a manner which demonstrates comprehension of selected readings.

4. Writing: Be able to write compositions based on assigned material, using proper syntax and grammar.

   The students will

   4.01 write responses based on material read.
   4.02 write original compositions.

Performance Standards (continued)

5. Grammar: Be able to apply their knowledge of more advanced grammar especially through conversation and writing.

   The students will

   5.01 apply previously acquired grammar.
   5.02 apply the finer distinctions in grammatical structures.

6. Culture: Be able to possess knowledge and appreciation of the cultural contributions of the speakers of the target language.

   The students will

   6.01 demonstrate a recognition of the attitudes of the culture of the speakers of the target language.
   6.02 illustrate tolerance and acceptance of the culture.

DRAFT

GENERIC FRAMEWORKS

MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN THE UNIVERSITIES

I. Major Concept of the First Year Course.

1. The language program is oriented toward the practical skills.
2. It includes the entire contents of a college level basic text (often with supplementary laboratory and workbooks.)
3. All four language skills are considered and a basis for grading,
4. Culture and civilization are part of the course (i.e. passtimes, sports, school and university life, dress, letter writing etc.)
5. Students should develop elementary communication skills and cross-cultural understanding according to the ACTFL Guidelines recommended by the Board of Regents of the State University System of Florida.

II. Goals and Objectives of the First Year Course.

1. Speaking
    - a) Operate in a limited capacity within very predictable areas of need; process sufficient vocabulary, but not limited to, greetings, social pleasantries, classroom objects and activities, personal data, family relationships, daily activities and interests, weather and time expressions, transportation and travel, ordering in a restaurant, and shopping.
    - b) Respond without reference to English within the limits of vocabulary and structures of the course.
2. Comprehension
    - a) Recognize the typical word order patterns of sentences;
    - b) Have sufficient comprehension to understand some memorized words within predictable area of need.
3. Reading
    - a) Comprehend reading material that has been presented in class including, but not limited to, items on menus, schedules and time tables, maps and signs.
    - b) Have sufficient understanding of written target language to interpret highly contextualized words or cognates within predictable areas; material requires successive rereading and checking.
4. Culture
    - a) Be aware of basic aspects of the target language culture including, but not limited to, holidays, customs, common foods, leisure activities, and selected artistic forms (music, dance, graphic arts, cinema.)
    - b) Compare and contrast aspects of the culture of people in target language countries with the culture of the United States, including common non-verbal responses.

UNIVERSITY LEVEL

III. Laboratory Activities.

Interactive laboratory exercises should be an integral part of the curriculum, including a laboratory examination towards the end of the course. Attendance should be mandatory and monitored.

IV. Student Performance Standards.

After successfully completing this course, the student will

1. Possess sufficient basic vocabulary and structure to comprehend others and express him/herself in areas of immediate need including, but not limited to, greetings, social pleasantries, classroom objects and activities, personal data, family relationships, daily activities and interests, weather and time expressions, transportation and travel, ordering in a restaurant, and shopping.

   The student will
   1.01 demonstrate knowledge and application of specific vocabulary areas of everyday life, such as:

   *greetings and social pleasantries
   *classroom objects and activities
   *personal data
   *family relationships
   *daily activities and interests
   *weather expressions and seasons
   *time/date expressions
   *transportation and travel
   *ordering in a restaurant and shopping
   *colors
   *numbers

2. Respond, without reference to English, within the limits of vocabulary and structures of the course.

   The student will
   2.01 respond to oral directions and classroom commands.
   2.02 choose correct responses to oral questions to exhibit comprehension of conversations and narratives.
   2.03 respond to a statement or question requiring no change in structure.
   2.04 respond to a question requiring structural change.

3. Recognize the letters of the alphabet as well as the typical word order patters of sentences.

   The student will
   3.01 recognize the letters of the alphabet.
   3.02 recognize and respond to interrogative and declarative statements in the affirmative, as well as the negative, in present tense.

4. Comprehend reading material that has been presented in class including, but not limited to, items on menus, schedules and time tables, and maps and signs.

   The student will
   4.01 demonstrate reading comprehension of passages containing familiar vocabulary and structures.

5. Write simple sentences in the present tense.

   The student will
   5.01 write declarative and interrogative sentences, in the affirmative and negative forms, in the present tense using correct word order.

6. Write personal data and simple biographic information.

   The student will
   6.01 write personal data including age, dates, nationality, address and other biographical information.

7. Be aware of basic aspects of the target language culture including, but not limited to, holidays, customs, common foods, leisure-time activities, and selected artistic forms (music, dance, and graphic arts).

   The student will
   7.01 identify various regions of the world where the target language is spoken.
   7.02 identify some major holidays, festivals, customs, and historical events of people speaking the target language.
   7.03 identify some typical foods, leisure-time activities, and selected artistic forms of the country or countries where the target language is spoken.

8. Compare and contrast aspects of the culture of the target language people with the culture of the United States, including common non-verbal responses.

   The student will
   8.01 give examples of the influence of the target culture on the development of North America.
   8.02 list influences of the language on English.
   8.03 demonstrate understanding of lifestyles of the people who speak the target language.
   8.04 demonstrate awareness of common non-verbal responses in the target language culture.

DRAFT

UNIVERSITIES

LEVEL II MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE COURSE

I. Major Concepts/Contents

The purpose of the level II course is to reinforce the fundamental skills previously acquired by the students. This course develops increased listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills as well as cultural awareness.

The content should include, but not be limited to, an expansion of the listening and oral skills previously acquired. Reading and writing should receive more emphasis, while oral communication remains the primary objective. This course should include a cultural survey of people in the country or countries of the target language.

II. Goals and Ojectives

After successfully completing this course, the student will be able to:

1. Speaking

a) answer and ask questions and make statements about present and past situations;
b) satisfy immediate needs using learned utterances;

2. Comprehension

a) understand spoken target language relating to familiar situations when spoken at a moderate tempo with standard intonation;
b) have sufficient comprehension to understand a number of memorized utterances in areas of immediate need;
c) comprehend slightly longer utterances in situations where the context aids understanding;
d) get main ideas but still requires repetition and/or slowed rate of speed for comprehension;

3. Reading

a) read selected passages within the context of one's acquired vocabulary and grammar;
b) demonstrate sufficient reading comprehension to understand printed information, including, but not limited to, announcements of public events, popular advertising, simple narration of events, newspaper headlines, and story titles;
c) sufficiently comprehend written language to interpret set expressions in areas of immediate need; material is still read for essential information and details are overlooked or misunderstood;

4. Writing

a) write short composition in target language using basic sentences;
b) write simple answers to personal questions within acquired vocabulary and grammar.

c) Generally cannot create own sentences in the target language but uses memorized material or transformation of familiar patterns.

5. Culture

a) demonstrate limited social competences in the foreign culture by showing comprehension of etiquette, customs, and sensitivities, and a basic knowledge of contributions to the arts, the sciences, and the humanities of the people in the target language country or countries;

b) possess a knowledge of aspects of the culture of people speaking the target language pertaining especially to historical highlights, leisure-time activities, festivals, and traditions.

III. Laboratory Activities

Interactive laboratory exercises should be an integral part of the curriculum, including a laboratory examination or classroom equivalent towards the end of the course. Attendance should be mandatory and monitored.

UNIVERSITIES

LEVEL II MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE COURSE

STUDENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

After successfully completing this course, the student will

1. Answer and ask questions and make statements in present and past tenses in order to satisfy personal needs.

   The student will
   - *1.01 answer questions about himself/herself.
   - 1.02 ask for and give directions.
   - 1.03 describe objects, people, actions and personal activities.

2. Understand spoken French relating to familiar situations when spoken at a moderate tempo with standard intonation.

   The student will
   - 2.01 respond to oral directions and classroom commands.
   - 2.02 answer questions based on a conversation or other oral narrative.

3. Read selected passages within the context of his/her acquired vocabulary and grammar.

   The student will
   - 3.01 answer questions pertaining to reading selections.
   - 3.02 read aloud familiar material evidencing acceptable pronunciation, intonation, stress and expression.

4. Demonstrate sufficient reading comprehension to understand printed information including, but not limited to, announcements of public events, popular advertising, simple narration of events, newspaper headlines, and story titles.

   The student will
   - 4.01 evidence comprehension after reading passages with a few unfamiliar words whose meanings should be ascertained through context.

5. Write basic sentences and answer personal questions within the acquired vocabulary and grammar.

   The student will
   - 5.01 answer questions in complete sentences about biographical data.
   - 5.02 write complete sentences using acquired vocabulary.

6. Write short compositions in French.

   The student will
   - 6.01 write a guided paragraph or dialogue.
   - 6.02 write a note of thanks, an invitation, or a phone message.

T

7. Demonstrate limited social competence in the foreign culture, by showing comprehension of common rules of etiquette, customs, and sensitivities, and a knowledge of contributions to the arts, sciences, and humanities by ~~French-~~ speaking people speaking the target language.

The student will

7.01 identify selected contributions to the arts and humanities by the target culture.

7.02 demonstrate limited social competence in a ~~French-speaking~~ target culture environment.

8. Possess a knowledge of aspects of the culture of ~~French-speaking~~ people speaking the target language pertaining to historical highlights, leisure-time activities, festivals, and traditions.

The student will

8.01 identify selected historical and cultural highlights of countries where the ~~French~~ target language language is spoken.

Appendix J

FLIF TASK FORCES

1. INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY

Evaluation Team Members

State Universities	Community Colleges	Public Schools	Guests	FLIF Consultants/Staff
James L. Wyatt	Marie D. Smith	Eleanor Garcia	D. Birdsong	Dave Ehlert
Juan Caballero	Jennifer J. Burg		J. Casagrande	Rodolfo Cortina
James Earl Norman				Ron Bryant
				Fred Daniels

2. LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT

Evaluation Team Members

State Universities	Community Colleges	Public Schools	Guests	FLIF Consultants/Staff
Irene d'Almeida	Dorothy Clemmons	Lissi Spencer		Paul Parker
Ernest L. Weiser	John Pawlowski	Shelley L. Waters		
	Rosita Martinez	Esther Oteiza		

3. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation Team Members

State Universities	Community Colleges	Public Schools	Guests	FLIF Consultants/Staff
Raymond Gay-Crosier	Helen McLean	Belle Altice	Dolly Young	Ivy Mitchell
		Dick Saporita		Wally Lyhskov
		Carmine Zinn		Ana Roca
				Angela Lupo-Anderson
				Anthony Cervone
				Frank Medley Jr.

4. THE SPECIAL-CATEGORY STUDENT

Native Speakers (of Spanish, French, etc.)
Students with Foreign Residence
Foreign Students

Evaluation Team Members

State Universities	Community Colleges	Public Schools	Guests	FLIF Consultants/Staff
Reinaldo Sánchez	Oswaldo López	Mary Johnson	Reynaldo Jiménez	Ana Roca
Carlos Cano	Bill Sarkis	Angel Bustelo		

5. CLASSICAL AND LESS COMMONLY TAUGHT LANGUAGES

Evaluation Team Members

State Universities	Community Colleges	Public Schools	Guests	FLIF Consultants/Staff
Karl-Heinrich Barsch	Ann Bachmann		Linda Gaskin	Ron Bryant
			Sheila Dickison	

6. TASK FORCE ON ARTICULATION

Anthony Cervone
Raymond Gay-Crosier
Oswaldo López
Bill Sarkis
Lissi Spencer
Mary Johnson

FLIF Consultants/Staff

Ana Roca

COMPANIES PRODUCING FILMS AND VIDEOTAPES FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Aims Media, Inc.
6901 Woodley Ave.
Van Nuys, CA 91406

Agency for Instructional Television
Box A
Bloomington, IN 47401

Amer. Management Assn., Inc.
135 W. 50th St.
New York, NY 10020

Amer. Educational Films
Box 8188
Nashville, TN 37207

Amer. Media, Inc.
1454 30th St.
West Des Moines, IA 50265

Amer. Natl. Red Cross
17th and D St. NW
Washington, DC 20006

Atlantis Productions, Inc.
1252 La Granada Dr.
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360

Beacon Films
PO Box 575
1250 Washington St.
Norwood, MA 02062

Phoenix/BFA Films and Video, Inc.
468 Park Ave. South
New York, NY 10016

BNA Communications, Inc.
9417 Decoverly Hall Rd.
Rockville, MD 20850

Brazos Films
10341 San Pablo Ave.
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Bullfrog Films, Inc.
Oley, PA 19547

Canamedia Productions, Ltd.
Suite 301
27 Soho St.
Toronto, Ontario M5T 1Z7

Carousel Films, Inc.
241 East 34th St.
Room 304
New York, NY 10016

CBA/Fox Video
23705 Industrial Park Dr.
Farmington Hills, MI 48024

Centron Educational Films
3710 Commercial Ave.
Northborrk, IL 60062

Churchill Films
662 N. Robertson Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90069

Cinema Guild
Division of Document Associates
1697 Broadway
New York, NY 10019

Comex System, Inc.
The Mill Cottage
Mendham, NJ 07945

Coronet Instructional Films
3710 Commercial Ave.
Northbrook, IL 60062

CRM Educational Films
674 Via De La Valle
PO Box 641
Del Mar, CA 92014

Cornell Univ. ETV Center
Ithaca, NY 14850

Encyclopedia Britannica Educational Corp.
425 N. Michigan Ave.
Chicago, IL 60611

Ecufilm
810 12th Ave. S.
Nashville, TN 37203

Family Communications, Inc.
4802 Fifth Ave.
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Films Incorporated
1213 Wilmette Ave.
Wilmette, Il. 60091

Film Communicators
11136 Weddington St.
N. Hollywood, CA 91601

First-Run Features
144 Bleeker St.
New York, NY 10012

Filmfair Communications
10900 Ventura Blvd.
Studio City, CA 91604

Films for the Humanities, Inc.
PO Box 2053
Princeton, NJ 08540

Gulf Publishing Co. Video
PO Box 2608
Houston, TX 77001

Great Plains Instructional TV Library
Univ. of Nebraska
PO Box 80669
Lincoln, NB 68501

VIDEOTAPES, page 4

Handel Film Corp.
8730 Sunset Blvd.
W. Hollywood, CA 90069

Icarus Films
200 Park Ave. S.
New York, NY 10003

International Film Bureau
352 S. Michigan Ave.
Chicago, IL 60604

IFEX Films
201 W. 52nd St.
New York, NY 10019

International Historic Films
PO Box 29035
Chicago, IL 60629

Ind. Univ.
Audio-Visual Center
Bloomington, IN 47405

Journal Films, Inc.
930 Pitner
Evanston, IL 60202

Karl Video Corporation
899 W. 16th St.
Newport Beach, CA 92663

Walter J. Klein Co., Ltd.
6301 Carmel Rd.
PO Box 220766
Charlotte, NC 28222

Lauron Productions
56 Shaftesbury Ave.
Toronto, Ont. Can. M4T 1A3

Learning Corporation of America
1350 Ave. of the Americas
New York, NY 10019

Lozanov Learning Institute
6621 Snyder Plaza
Dallas, TX 75205

Media Guild
11526 Sorrento Valley Rd.
Suite J.
San Diego, CA 92121

Mendizza and Associates

McGraw-Hill Films
674 Via de la Valle
PO Box 641
Del Mar, CA 92014

Milner-Fenwick, Inc.
2125 Greenspring Dr.
Timonium, MD 21093

Moody Institute of Science
Educational Film Division
12000 E. Washington Blvd.
Whittier, CA 90606

Museum of Modern Art of Latin America
Organization of American States
1889 F. St. NW
Washington, DC 20006

Mastervision
969 Park Ave.
New York, NY 10028

MTI Teleprograms
3710 Commerical Ave.
Northbrook, IL 60062

Natl. Educational Media, Inc.
21601 Devonshire St. Suite 300
Chatsworth, CA 91311

Natl. Fire Protection Assn.
Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02269

Natl. Geographic Society
17th and M. Sts. NW
Washington, DC 20036

Oxford Films, Inc.
SEE Paramount-Oxford Films
5451 Marathon St.
Hollywood, CA 90038

Paulist Productions
PO Box 1057
Pacific Palisades, CA 90272

Public Broadcasting Service
475 L'Enfant Plaza SW
Washington, DC 20024

Perspective Films
3710 Commercial Ave.
65 E. South Water St.
Northbrook IL 60062

Pyramid Films
PO Box 1048 Santa Monica, CA 90406

Phoenix/ BFA Films and Video, Inc.
468 Park Ave. South
New York, NY 10016

Professional Research, Inc.
930 Pitner
Evanston, IL 60202

Public Television Library
475 L'Enfant Plaza SW
Washington, DC 20024

Roundtable Films, Inc.
113 N. San Vicente
Beverly Hills, CA 90211

Martha Stuart
Anthony St. PO Box 127
Hillsdale, NY 12529

Southerby Productions
5000 E. Anaheim St.
Long Beach, CA 90804

Tel-A-Train
309 N. Market St.
Chattanooga, TN 37405

Telstar Productions
366 N. Prior
St. Paul, MN 55104

Texture Films, Inc.
Division of Public Media, Inc.
PO Box 1337
Skokie, IL 60076

Time-Life Films, Inc.
100 Eisenhower Dr.
PO Box 644 Paramus, NJ 07652

TPC Training Systems
1301 South Grove Ave.
PO Box 1030
Barrington, IL 60010

Medcom, Inc/Trainex Div.
1900 MacArthur Blvd.
Irvine, CA 92715

Trans-World Films
332 S. Michigan Ave.
Chicago, IL 60604

Univ. of Ariz. Film Library
Audiovisual Bldg.
Tucson, AZ 85721

Univ. of Calif. Ext. Media Center
2223 Fulton St.
Berkeley, CA 94720

Univ. of Mich. Medical School
Audio-Visual Service
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

U.S. Natl. Audiovisual Center
General Services Admin.
Washington, DC 20409

Univ. of Tex. Hospital and Tumor Institute
Houston, TX 77025

Univ. of Texas
Balcones Research Ctr. 2
10100 Burnet Rd.
Austin, TX 78758

VCI, Incorporated

Visucom Productions, Inc.
OP Box 5472
1047 Whipple Ave.
Redwood City, CA 94063

Video Training Resource, Inc.
7900 W. 73th St., Ste. 145
Edina, MN 55435

Walt Disney Educational Media, Co.
500 S. Buena Vista St.
Burbank, CA 91521

Wombat Productions
250 West 57th Street
Suite 916
New York, NY 10019

Weston Woods Studios
389 Newtown Turnpike
Weston, CT 06883

Appendix L

List of Abbreviations

AATF	American Association of Teachers of French
AATG	American Association of Teachers of German
AATI	American Association of Teachers of Italian
AATSP	American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese
ACTFL	American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
AF	Adjunct Faculty
BOR	Board of Regents
DOE	Department of Education
DPS	Division of Public Schools
ETS	Educational Testing Service
FAMU	Florida Agricultural and Mechanics University
FAU	Florida Atlantic University
FCOMME	Florida Consortium of Multilingual and Multicultural Education
FFLA	Florida Foreign Language Association
FIRN	Florida Information Resource Network
FIU	Florida International University
FL	Foreign Languages
FLIF	Foreign Language Instruction in Florida
FSI	Foreign Service Institute
FSN	Florida Satellite Network
FSU	Florida State University
FT	Full-time
FTE	Full-time equivalent
MLA	Modern Language Association
PS	Public Schools
PT	Part-time
SBCC	State Board of Community Colleges
SUS	State University System
UCF	University of Central Florida
UF	University of Florida
UNF	University of North Florida
USF	University of South Florida
UWF	University of West Florida

This publication was produced at an annual cost of $2519.35 or $2.52 per copy to inform the public about a University program.
Member of the State University System/Equal Opportunity Institution.
Publications Department 4101-0687